SALVE MATER

FREDERICK JOSEPH KINSMAN

Kinsman, Frederick J.

Salve Mater

Call No. 260

Accession No. 8149

Regulations

Any pupil of Nazareth College may take books from the Library.

Each book may be kept two weeks, except books in great demand. which may be restricted to one week. A book that may be kept two weeks may be renewed for two weeks more on application, unless it is reserved for another borrower.

Each book kept overtime is subject to a fine of two cents a day until its return.

Books should be examined for mutilations, etc., at the time of borrowing, as the last borrower must be held responsible.

NAZARETH COLLEGE LIBRARY

260
8149

Date Due

FEB 20			

SALVE MATER

LONGMANS, GREEN AND CO.
55 FIFTH AVENUE, NEW YORK
221 EAST 20TH STREET, CHICAGO
TREMONT TEMPLE, BOSTON
210 VICTORIA STREET, TORONTO

LONGMANS, GREEN AND CO. LTD.
39 PATERNOSTER ROW, E C 4, LONDON
53 NICOL ROAD, BOMBAY
6 OLD COURT HOUSE STREET, CALCUTTA
167 MOUNT ROAD, MADRAS

SALVE MATER

BY

FREDERICK JOSEPH KINSMAN

NEW EDITION

LONGMANS, GREEN AND CO.
NEW YORK · LONDON
1927

DISCARDED

COPYRIGHT · 1920
BY LONGMANS, GREEN AND CO.

COPYRIGHT · 1927
BY LONGMANS, GREEN AND CO.

First Edition, February 1920
Reprinted May 1920, December 1920, May 1922
Reprinted with New Preface November 1927

MADE IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

TO MY MOTHER

MARY LOUISA KINSMAN

CONTENTS

		PAGE
PREFACE		vii
CHAPTER		
I	INTRODUCTION—ANTECEDENTS	1
II	ST. PAUL'S SCHOOL	14
III	OXFORD	28
IV	MINISTERIAL WORK	49
V	DELAWARE	65
VI	ANGLICANISM	74
VII	THE ENGLISH REFORMATION	112
VIII	ANGLICAN ORDERS	153
IX	PREJUDICE AGAINST ROMANISM	184
X	ATTRACTION TO ROMANISM	204
XI	THE PAPACY	232
XII	NEW DOGMAS	259
XIII	JESUIT ETHICS	279
XIV	CONVERSION	292

AUTHOR'S PREFACE

1919

The purpose of this book has been outlined in its introductory chapter and summarized in the one which concludes it. It was written in the seclusion of the Maine woods under circumstances which gave access to few books, and may contain errors in detail concerning matters on which the writer had to trust solely to memory. Yet, as a record of experience, the narrative is as careful and accurate as it could be made; and when possible, he has quoted letters of which he happened to have copies.

It records changes in ecclesiastical opinions involving change in ecclesiastical allegiance, and aims at making two things clear. First, that there has been no change in principles, merely in the mode of their application; and, second, that although the writer has abandoned the interpretation of Anglicanism which regards it as a form of Catholicism, his personal feeling for it is one of profound personal gratitude. He cannot expect many to sympathize with his peculiar point of view, but hopes that he has made clear what this is.

The book was finished on the fourteenth of November, the last act of a life that is ended. Ten days later, the writer was received into the Communion of the Roman Catholic Church. This has given glimpses into a new and wonderful world, always close at hand and surrounding us, though many of us are utterly unconscious of it, involving new views of everything. The past

appears through a veil, making it difficult to recall just how it seemed when it was present. It would seem now that various matters touched upon in this book should be dealt with in a way different from that which was wholly natural a few weeks ago. Yet it is much better that the book be left as it is, wholly the product of old associations to which it refers, and that the impression made by these be not at all blurred by others which are wholly new.

F. J. K.

PORTLAND, MAINE,
December 5, 1919.

AUTHOR'S PREFACE

1927

This book was written during the Autumn of 1919, when, after perplexities lasting about five years, I had reached the decision that it was my duty to seek admission into the Roman Catholic Church. It is not the account of a conversion, but of steps leading to a conversion. Conversion is the change that comes to one who, by grace of God, has received the gift of faith. This book is merely an account of the flounderings of a High Church Anglican struggling toward correct opinions on certain theological and ecclesiastical matters, and by degrees coming to recognize that, in regard to these, "Rome" is right. This is a very different thing from the life of faith and freedom in the Church.

I have not looked at the book since the proof-sheets were corrected eight years ago, and shall never look at it again. It was intended to be, as the original Preface stated, "the last act of a life that is ended," * an account to those who were demanding one of why, hav-

* It proved to be not quite the last act. This was an incident of the year 1925. I had been told that Bishop Ives of North Carolina, on becoming a Catholic in 1850, had left his ring and cross in Rome, where they were placed in St. Peter's. This was a bit of Anglican precedent I wished to follow! By the kindness of Cardinal Merry del Val, the wish was granted: and the sending of a ring and cross to Rome, rather than the writing of *Salve Mater,* represented the actual end of an Anglican career.

ing been trained for fifty years in the Episcopal Church and for twenty-five in its ministry, I was abandoning it.

In writing the book, I tried to tell everything which had bearing, even remote, on the formation of my religious convictions, everything which accounted for change in these, and everything which explained why I had been dilatory in reaching inevitable conclusions.

If I were to read the book now, much of the detail would probably strike me as irrelevant, and most that concerned church-experiences as unreal. In recalling the old life, it seems less my own experience than that of some one I happened to know a good deal about. This seems like a pose, for I took my Anglicanism more seriously than most, and was absorbed in my work. I should probably wish to change references to the Catholic Church to make them fit my present view of things, now seen as from a center in right relations and proportions, rather than from strange angles and tangents. I should probably wish to doctor it up, possibly by major operations, certainly by poultices in the form of foot-notes. Yet, if there were any discrepancy between what the book states and my present impressions of the past, the book would be right. It gives the best account I could of things, at the time of writing, real and vivid, and should be left for what it is, a record of non-Catholic experience. It might be made to sound more edifying—and be less truthful.

Had I ever accepted the Episcopal Church for what it really is, one of the most attractive forms of Protestantism, I might still be happily at work, optimistic in face of modernism, convinced that "catholicity"

consists in toleration of contradictory views. I could never have gone as far as Bishop Brown addressing Bishop Manning: "You presumably are extremely orthodox and I a condemned heretic; but fundamentally we are one!" Yet, I might have acquiesced in efforts toward unity, which seek to "get together on the basis of a common faith" by reducing faith to its vanishing point. These remind me of the first part of that cheerful chorus in Handel's *Messiah*, "All we like sheep have gone astray," wherein the various groups of sheep jubilantly fugue their strayings and finally join in the sonorous unison, "Every one to his own way." Some attempts to discover unity stop there, with no sequel corresponding to the finale of that chorus, representing an overpowering penitence at the sight of the Cross, which would accept unity after the Divine pattern. Had I ever been an Episcopalian Protestant, I might still be working along old lines.

I was, however, one of those who regard the Anglican Communion as part of the One Catholic and Apostolic Church, loyal to the standards of "antiquity": and my efforts to square facts with theories proved a nightmare. This was the sort of thing I had to tell my old friends. Yet I wished to make clear the extent of my obligations to the Episcopal Church, for convictions and associations, for gratification of special tastes and coddling of pet vanities, for congenial work. Never had I greater personal gratitude for my old environment than at the time I was leaving it. I did not wish to leave and fought growing convictions as long as I could. I was never tempted to conceal convictions and clutch at

position and income. Old beliefs gone, or even shaken, I must have given up my official post, even had I never become a Catholic. By the end of 1918, I saw that this was necessary, and shortly after left Delaware. Yet, not until the following August, did I come to accept "Roman claims," and even then took no action, as I wished the authorities of the Episcopal Church to dispose of me, so that I might act as an individual, not as one holding an official post. On November 23, 1919, I was received into the Church in Baltimore.

Experiences as a Catholic have changed my standards of value, so that I do not now regard some aspects of the old life precisely as I did eight years ago. Possibly, too, my feeling for it has been modified by what has seemed unfairness on the part of some former associates. They were bound to condemn, and even resent, my repudiation of what they naturally felt should continue as sacred for me as it was for them: and I asked no quarter. Yet I was not prepared for some extremes of bitterness.* Yet, ecclesiastical matters apart, for former associates and associations I have much the same feeling as ever; and this has been kept alive by the persistent friendliness of many, such as Bishop Parker of New Hampshire, Bishop Brewster of Maine, the Rector of Shepton Beauchamp, and scores of people in Delaware. "I think you ought to know," wrote Deaconess Knapp from Detroit in 1919, "that, although

* One clergyman, for example, whom I never met, announced that I was "violently insane" with the corroborative detail "in charge of two keepers." I cannot venture to contradict him, being a prejudiced witness, and also fearful that my "keepers" might put me in a straitjacket!

everyone here is talking of you, and your friends are terribly pained, I have not heard a single unkind word." I have been most grateful for such magnanimity and have exulted in it as something worthy of high nobility.

Nevertheless, once a Catholic, it was difficult for me to take in that I had ever been anything else. Old things became dim, and even those most familiar seemed different. I remember reciting the Nicene Creed one day as I was crossing our lake on the ice, knowing that, except in the definiteness of its concluding clauses, it meant nothing new, yet acutely conscious of a *right* to say it that I had not had before. So of many other things. Presuppositions may remain unchanged, Divine revelation, Our Lord's Godhead, One Church as instrument of salvation; yet what is vaguely held and rather pointless outside the Church is actual and practically applied within. My attitude toward the Church is one of entire submission. "Crucifixion of the intellect," some object. I should call it "resurrection," but, so long as I experience the fact, shall not quarrel about the word. My chief consciousness as a Catholic is of a new freedom. Cardinal Gibons, in a little address to me, said that in spite of "exterior hardships," which he knew I must encounter, he hoped I might enjoy "interior sunshine." That, I think, expresses what has been given. I have never been an ecstatic convert. For a time, I was self-conscious as a "Papist," having formerly disbelieved in the Pope; but I soon got over that, and have gone on in a very matter-of-course, matter-of-fact way, without extraordinary experiences, yet, in spite of regret for failures

to make full use of privileges, with a feeling of serene content.

There have been plenty of "exterior hardships," separations, alienations, money-difficulties, loss of opportunity for a man's normal work. When I was younger, I was ambitious for place and recognition, though I came to value them chiefly as giving opportunities for usefulness. Now I care very much more for the luxuries of obscurity. But I was also ambitious for plenty of work in congenial surroundings; and that feeling I have not lost. It is a keen disappointment to recognize myself as a derelict. But what of it? A friend once did me the honor to write: "When you see your mistake and what you have lost, we think you are honest enough to own up." I made no mistake whatever in the things to which he referred: but I am trying frankly to "own up" to external losses. Yet, what of it? During these recent years, my chief practical duty has been the care of my family, necessitating presence at home most of the time. Various people with kind plans for me have disapproved: but I have known perfectly well what I was bound to do and have found wonderful satisfaction in it. We have had the best years of our family life. Had I been free to do so, I should have followed a different course. But things have to be as they are: and I would have nothing different.

There are troubles which may go deeper than such things as these. Converts sometimes encounter "born Catholics" who are inimical to them, occasionally, it is said, on "racial" grounds. They have experiences which would have been impossible in former surround-

ings, and may even discover among those in authority individuals who do not measure up to their standards, not only of good judgment and good breeding, but even of the finer moral qualities. Feeble converts become disheartened, disgusted, indifferent, and sometimes lapse. Yet, what have faults and limitations in certain Catholics, which, in the nature of things, must exist, to do with the question of allegiance to the Church? Fortunately for us, it is the Church of all sinners as well as of all saints. Special conditions may impose isolation, and yet be the very conditions which prevent isolation of a worse sort.

A lady remarked to me: "In church, you must feel like a fish out of water." As a matter of fact, I feel like a fish in his native element. Every Catholic church is home, all the more that the Church of the Mass is the Church of the masses. I often wonder how many share my peculiar delight in the prayers of the Missal with their wealth of historic association, and my satisfaction at being lost in a crowd instead of being parked in the great open spaces of exclusive respectability. What the lady meant was that, in the churches I frequent, most of them built by people of Irish and French-Canadian descent, I may not encounter many fellow-citizens of my own particular brand—if I stopped to think of it. If I went to church according to my New England heredity, I should have to be a Congregationalist; and I do not choose to be a Congregationalist! The Catholic Church contains all sorts and conditions, all races and classes, of men, and blurs and blots out unmeaning lines of division. However,

though but one of a multitude, one may continue one's self, and this in spite of mistaken expectations. A kindly priest once addressed me as "one who had left the British to come over to the Irish." As I am not, and never have been, anything but wholly American, this did not mean anything. The only normal effect of the Catholic faith on devotion to country is to deepen it. Converts have, and must have, special difficulties; but to dwell on them is to lose sense of proportion. I have had my fair share; but they count for nothing in comparison with the advantages of Catholic associations.

In spite of restricted opportunities, I have seen something of the Church in various parts of this country and of Canada. During recent winters, I have had some months of lecture-work, thanks chiefly to the Bishop of Cleveland and the Sacred Heart nuns. This has taken me into many parishes, seminaries, colleges and schools. I have never yet been farther from home than Chicago, but expect soon to visit St. Paul, St. Louis and San Francisco. In particular, I have valued contact with religious Orders: Jesuits in the Novitiate at Poughkeepsie, where the Father-Rector has allowed me to come for brief retreats; Benedictines in St. Vincent's Archabbey, where I spent a Christmas, and Capucins at St. Fidelis' Seminary, in the diocese of Pittsburgh; Paulists, with whom I spent weeks in New York and Washington; Maryknoll, where Father Walsh has had me half a dozen times; Father Sargent, O.S.B., at Portsmouth Priory; and briefer glimpses of Franciscans at St. Bonaventure's in the diocese of Buffalo,

of Sulpicians in Baltimore, of Dominicans at Providence, and of Holy Ghost Fathers at Duquesne University and Farmdale. Also the Sisters, of whom I know best the Religious of the Sacred Heart, the Visitandines of Wilmington, the Cenacle nuns in Newport, and four Orders having schools in Cleveland. All this has given a conception of the practical workings of the Church which has been stimulating and satisfying.

People looking toward the Church sometimes write to me. I usually respond by reminding them that the only reason for "going over to Rome" is conviction that the Roman Catholic Church is the Divinely-instituted embodiment of the Christian religion. Attractions or repulsions in matters of detail have nothing to do with the question. Then, too, they must be reckless of consequences. One forced to jump over a precipice need not speculate whether there may be feather-beds at the bottom; there is more likelihood of rocks. One thinking much of possible consequences in trying to determine spiritual allegiance is probably not much in earnest and had probably best stay where he is and make the most of things. If, however, one knows "Rome" to be the true Church, he must get into it as fast as possible. If his experience is like mine, he will begin to live over again, very simply perhaps, but with great satisfaction.

In writing *Salve Mater* I had in mind certain definite individuals who were wishing me to give an account of myself in 1919. Everything in the book was written with the thought of what ought to be said to particular

friends. (One of them, the Reverend Dr. Laird of Wilmington, did not live to read it.) So, in writing this Preface, I have had in mind certain old friends, who are wondering what I think of it after eight years of seclusion and whether I am not the victim of disillusion and regrets. They may have heard, as I have, reports that I am "unhappy" and about to "come back." The simple fact is that I regard my reception into the Catholic Church as the best thing in my life and have experienced nothing but new "joy and peace in believing."

Birchmere,
Michaelmas, 1927.

SALVE MATER

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION—ANTECEDENTS

During the past year, I have had to make three decisions, vitally important to myself, and significant to friends as indicating abandonment of convictions which we have long shared as the basis of the chief hopes and energies of our lives. In the first place, it became necessary for me to resign jurisdiction over the Diocese of Delaware of which I had been Bishop for over ten years; in the second, to renounce the Orders of the Episcopal Church; and in the third, its Communion. These decisions were followed by recognition of the duty to seek admission into the Communion of the Roman Catholic Church. The decision about jurisdiction was reached in December, 1918, the one about Orders in the following June, and both carried into effect in a letter to the Presiding Bishop of the Episcopal Church sent on July 1st. The other decisions were not reached until August. For several reasons, the intention to seek admission into the Roman Catholic Church has not yet (November) been carried out; so that this book has been written in, and out of, old surroundings. Of those which must determine future courses, if any space of life or work be left, I can as yet know nothing.

I owe some account of myself to two sets of people; first, to my friends in the Episcopal Church, especially my people in Delaware; and second, to pupils of past years who will wish to know the reasons which have forced abandonment of what they know to have been firmly held convictions. This book, therefore, has been written primarily for personal friends. This fact explains the giving of personal details, and the assumption that the motive underlying its comments will be understood without need of special explanation.

I have undertaken to answer two questions: (1) Why have I abandoned the Episcopal Church for the Roman Catholic? and (2) Why did it take so long to see the duty? The attempt to perform this task during three quiet months in Birchmere has shown the necessity of touching on many matters of which at the outset I had no thought. It has been necessary to review the course of my whole life, and to outline the whole of the experience which has been responsible for the formation of views of what constitutes the Church.

To answer the first question, it has seemed necessary to give a detailed account of my religious education, indicating certain fixed points which have been decisive in the formation of all my ecclesiastical conceptions; to summarize also an experience in ministerial work which induced the feeling that the Episcopal Church fails to realize ideals which her teaching makes many regard as all-important; and to outline various revisions of judgment in regard to the Roman Catholic Church, removing prejudices which until very recently would have kept me out of her Communion, and bringing con-

viction that in this alone is full realization of the Christian life. I have wished to put myself on record in regard to changes of view on important matters, for the sake of correcting what I now regard as erroneous in my former teaching. Correction takes the form chiefly of addition. There is very little in what I have said in the formal teaching of past years, which I should now wish wholly to unsay; there is not a great deal that I should wish to say very differently: but I should add much, and the additions would wholly change my estimate of the English Reformation. Dr. Gairdner described the first stage of this as merely "the old religion with the Pope left out." I should now wish to teach "the old religion with the Pope put back."

To answer the second question, it has seemed necessary to refer to antecedents and associations, which involved living for almost half a century with little actual knowledge of the Roman Catholic Church, and which made any change of ecclesiastical allegiance seem unnatural or impossible. I have referred in detail to my unusually pleasant and congenial experiences during four years of preparation for Orders in England, and during twenty-four years of ministry in the Episcopal Church, which seemed to impose special obligations of holding to my assigned post, and extenuate possibly, though they could not excuse, the slowness to heed the call to leave them all behind. It has been necessary also to detail erroneous conceptions of Roman Catholicism, and prejudices against it, which have only been overcome by a heavy bombardment of working facts.

To the Episcopal Church I owe everything of chief

value in my life; and especially the fixed ideas which, as they have worked themselves out in practice, have compelled my abandonment of her Ministry and Communion. In view of the abandonment, it may seem insincere to profess continuance of attachment; nevertheless it is simply true that, even with changed proportionate values, I still have great veneration for the Church and her achievements, and an enhanced feeling of personal gratitude for the associations and opportunities which were given me. From my point of view, I am simply carrying out more fully and consistently principles and duties, which, through the Episcopal Church, I have come to consider of highest importance, by giving allegiance where they seem to be given fullest realization. I have ceased to believe that Anglicanism is Catholicity, and have come to believe that "Romanism" is: but as Anglicanism has taught me to revere Catholic ideals of truth and unity, I must still honour and value it. I wish my friends to know this. To say so may seem insincere, inconsistent, incongruous. Nevertheless it is true. This implies no uncertainty as to the duty either of giving up the Episcopal Church, or of submitting to the Roman Catholic. I have wavered a long time; but I am not wavering now. For long I have been uncertain what Our Lord's Will for me was: now I know.

In thus accounting for myself, I have not wished to give the impression that I regard my course as edifying, or that recording opinions and acts implies approval. I think many of my past opinions utterly foolish, and many of my acts indefensible, especially the not seeing

the duty of change several years ago. Those who disagree with my conclusions will be noticing personal limitations which may be taken fairly to discount my judgments. Things of this sort I have wished plainly to appear, although I have not commented on them. I remember a bit of advice once given me by the Reverend Dr. William R. Huntington: "Don't be so anxious to point out the weak points in your own position: let the other people find those." I have no wish to undertake a defence of myself personally, least of all for my course during the past three years, a time of perplexity, fluctuations of feeling and judgment, inconsistency and paralysis of the will. These are normal effects of doubt. As I wrote to a friend, "I have simply been an example of a 'double-minded man, unstable in all his ways.'" Yet I have confidence in the validity of my ecclesiastical judgments, not only for myself but for others with the same point of view. None of my opinions are original, in substance or form of statement. Yet as I have come to hold them, they have received corroboration and illustration from a varied experience.

The narrative is not an autobiography. It seeks to account for the development of opinions on one set of subjects, not to exhibit a personal life and work, matters of no interest to any except those who know all about them already. One's personality, however, is a sort of Jack-in-the-Box, forever bobbing up, no matter how often rapped on the head and clamped down: and many incidents in one's experience contribute to the formation of any set of opinions. I have tried to tell

everything that has bearing, even remote, on the formation of my opinions as to what constitutes the Church: but I have tried to exclude everything else. The narrative relates not to "a spiritual pilgrimage," but to an ecclesiastical quest, to an effort to answer the question, "What is the Catholic Church?" The recording of the various phases and stages of this one aspect of one's mental growth may give the impression that life has been one long Gregorian Tone—frequently off-key. My friends know that there have been frequent interludes of Gilbert and Sullivan!

The chief purposes of the book are two: to show that the giving up of the Episcopal Church for the Roman Catholic was, in its most obvious aspect, an act of simple honesty; and to publish such views on historical subjects as differ from those given in my former books. In dealing with these, I have not undertaken to give any complete presentation of the several subjects, merely to elaborate the special points which have induced me to abandon former contentions. These chapters are narrative, rather than argument; an account of modification or change in my own estimates, not an attempt to make such a statement as might seem conclusive to other people. They deal, however, with points of vital importance to all who have shared my old point of view. The book is partly confession, partly retraction, chiefly the avowal of hopeful conviction.

ANTECEDENTS AND EARLY EDUCATION

The Roman Catholic Church played no part in the world in which I was born and bred. My family belong

to the Connecticut Western Reserve in Ohio with a background of Connecticut and Massachusetts: they were members of the Episcopal Church into which two generations had come out of New England Congregationalism. Our earliest American ancestor came to this country in the *Mayflower* in 1620; none from whom we derive descent came over later than 1680. Along every line we are descended from New England Puritans.

The Kinsmans derive from Robert Kinsman, who came to Ipswich, Massachusetts, in 1635; whose grandson, Robert 3rd, removed to Norwich, Connecticut, in 1721. Among the families from whom we are descended through Kinsman marriages, are the Conants, Burleys, Warrens, Watermans, Thomases of Marshfield, Perkinses of Norwich, and Douglases of Plainfield. My great-grandfather, John Kinsman of Norwich, was one of the largest landholders in the Connecticut Western Reserve. His land list for 1813 showed holdings in every County, including Cunningham's (Kelley's) Island, amounting in all to forty-six thousand acres, of which the largest tract was in Trumbull County in the townships of Gustavus and Kinsman. My grandfather, his youngest son, was born in Kinsman in 1807, was after his father's death associated with his uncle, General Simon Perkins, in the Land Office in Warren, where he built the family homestead in 1833, and spent his life.

In 1840, he married Cornelia Granger Pease, youngest daughter of Judge Calvin Pease of Suffield, Connecticut, who served several terms on the Supreme Court of Ohio, and was for a time Chief Justice. The

Peases are descended from Robert Pease of Salem; and through them we are connected with the Goodells of Salem, Adamses of Ipswich, Spencers of Hartford, Kings of Enfield, Risleys of Glastonbury, and Grants of Windsor. My father, Frederick Kinsman Jr., was born in 1841, served in the Civil War in the 84th Ohio and as First Lieutenant of the 171st Ohio, and in 1867 married Mary Louisa Marvin.

My mother's father, Joseph Marvin, was born in Lyme, Connecticut, in 1807, a descendant of Reinold Marvin who settled in Lyme in 1640, and of Beckwiths, Demings, Lords and Millers, all of them families of the south Connecticut Valley. In 1837, he married Lucy Temple Dana, born in Newburyport, Massachusetts, a descendant of Richard Dana of Cambridge, and connected with the Buckminsters and Stanifords of Ipswich, Lees of Marblehead, Thorndikes of Beverley, and Tracys of Newburyport. Her grandfather, Dr. Joseph Dana, was for sixty-six years pastor of the South Church in Ipswich; an uncle, Dr. Daniel Dana, was pastor of the South Church, in Newburyport, and President of Dartmouth College; another uncle, Dr. Samuel Dana, was pastor of the South Church in Marblehead; and her father, Dr. Joseph Dana, removed from Newburyport to Ohio, to become Professor of Languages in the College at Athens, at one time destined to become the University of Ohio. All of my great-grandparents removed from New England to Ohio prior to 1830; my grandparents, although born elsewhere, all lived in Warren, where my parents and I were born.

Those who know Connecticut, Massachusetts, and the Connecticut Western Reserve in Ohio, will recognize what sort of religious and ecclesiastical background the names enumerated signify. All our forbears were New England Congregationalists, some in later generations being Presbyterians, one family Episcopalians. My great-grandmother Kinsman was chiefly instrumental in building the Presbyterian Church in Kinsman and gave the glebe. My grandfather Marvin, a graduate of Athens College, whose family were Presbyterians, became a Methodist minister, although never holding a regular charge.

My Kinsman grandparents became Episcopalians, as did my mother, who from her childhood preferred the Episcopal Church, and was confirmed while at boarding-school in Batavia, New York. My grandfather Kinsman was chief contributor to the building fund for Christ Church, Warren, in which my grandmother was a devout communicant. In view of their connection with the church, it was not inappropriate that the window over the altar was placed there as their memorial by their sons. My father and mother were married in Christ Church; and I was baptized there by the Reverend Cornelius Stevenson Abbott Sr. when I was four weeks old.

I was therefore brought up in the Episcopal Church in Warren.* I had my first religious instruction from

* The beginnings of my ecclesiastical career were ominous. A letter of my grandmother's, written when I was four, describes me as a disturber of the Warren congregation! "Little Cornelia was on her best behavior and seemed very

my mother, who was also my first Sunday School teacher, as she had charge of the Infant Class for a number of years. Later I was placed in a class taught by Miss Mary Iddings, who was the first to make me memorize the Prayer Book collects. For a year I also attended a class in the Presbyterian Sunday School, taught by Miss Ella Estabrook, my teacher in grammar school, who trained me in habits of reading the Bible. My connections and associations gave me a feeling of filial veneration not only for the Episcopal Church, but also for the Presbyterian, Congregational and Methodist Churches, to which so many of my own people belonged.* No one whom we knew was a Roman Catholic. In our world the Roman Catholic Church did not exist, save as a phenomenon in European travel, a bogy in history, and an idiosyncrasy of Irish servants.

So nearly as I can remember, the chief impressions left upon me by the religious training of home and Sunday School were, that God is our Father, that Our

much gratified with her first visit to her Grandmamma. She is a nice baby; and I am very proud of my little namesake. Freddy improves all the time, and is one of the dearest little boys I ever saw. You never saw anything like his devotion to his little sister. I believe he kisses her a thousand times a day. Last Sunday he went to church with the nurse and sat in our seat. Jenny Adams was there and sat with Mrs. Glidden. It was too funny to see their flirtation. They got their heads together and whispered; and then Fred would put his arm around her neck so lovingly, that it set nearly everyone to laughing in the church. I should judge that some of the congregation were more interested in watching them than in the sermon."

* In later years I have said many things indicating that

Lord gave an example of a beautiful life, and that it was one's duty to say prayers, to read the Bible and to attend church regularly, all for the purpose of keeping one's conscience active. My mother trained me in habits of obedience and industry; and stimulated the workings of my conscience, which, I think, was a sensitive one. Prayers consisted simply of the Lord's Prayer and such petitions for blessings on relatives and friends as I devised for myself. They would have been addresses to God the Father; for although I knew Our Lord was Son of God, I can not recall that I had any sense of His constant presence. I do not remember that church services made any special impression, although I attended them regularly. What I liked least was the sermons, which always seemed unintelligible.

Unitarianism seems to be Christianity almost evaporated. Yet I have high respect for Unitarians as clear-headed and consistent with an admirable record for culture and philanthropy. This I have expressed in two books. Respect for them dates from my boyhood when I was devoted to the stories of Miss Louisa M. Alcott, whom I knew to be a Unitarian. Her boys and girls were among the best friends of my young days; and her stories have always seemed to me to reflect the most healthy and admirable aspects of American life. My regard for them was brought vividly home in 1917 when I went to see a film-version of *Little Women* in New York. It seemed to bring up all the best hopes of my boyhood; and in certain scenes I found myself disgracefully disposed to weep. Looking furtively about to see if I had been caught at it, I discovered that the greater part of the audience was composed of gray-haired ladies and bald-headed men, many sniffing and making suspicious displays of handkerchiefs. It was a gathering of boys and girls of the late '70's and early '80's; and I was not alone in reviving the wistfulness of a vanished youth.

From the time I was eight, I was an insatiable reader, and had many books from the Sunday School Library; but I recall none that made any sort of religious impression. I think I did not read much in the Bible until I was eleven or twelve; but diaries kept at twelve show that I read three chapters a day, and five on Sundays. My first Bible shows marking of passages I thought specially good; and the solid lines in most places seem to indicate that it seemed disrespectful to leave any passage without token of approval! It would seem to me that those responsible for my religious training did all they could for a small boy.

We lived in Warren until I was thirteen years old. I was always interested in out-of-door activities, especially riding and driving, but always found time for reading. To my two grandfathers I owe an especial interest in history. They stimulated my curiosity about family traditions, the annals of the Western Reserve, and the history of the United States. I was also much interested in Dickens' *Child's History of England;* but American history was always to the fore. I was secretary of a Boys' Literary Club, at which biographical sketches of famous Americans were read. My own papers show much interest and considerable reading for a boy of twelve. I had an uneventful, healthy sort of boyhood, with good, simple educational foundations; but, although I think I had a vivid imagination, I cannot remember that it was particularly directed to religious matters. Religion seemed to be chiefly a matter of studying the Bible; and I found American history much more interesting.

Christ Church, Warren, was associated with the end, as well as with the beginning, of my life in the Episcopal Church. It was there on the Second Sunday in Lent, 1919, that I last celebrated and received Holy Communion.

CHAPTER II

ST. PAUL'S SCHOOL

At fourteen, I was sent to St. Paul's School, Concord, New Hampshire, entering in September, 1883, and leaving in June, 1887. All definiteness in religious impressions seems to have been derived from St. Paul's. The School at that time had a recognized place as first among church-schools for boys, and after thirty years of steady development was nearing the end of the first period in its history. It was inevitable that it should outgrow the simpler equipment and methods of its first days, from being a family become a college, and that change should indicate progress: yet all the older St. Paul's boys will ever feel that the first chapters of the School's history constitute its golden age. If it were necessary to specify a moment when this came to an end, it is probable that it might be placed in 1887, the year when the Old Chapel was superseded by the New. My VI Form year was the last in which the Old Chapel was the centre of the school life. It is easy to illustrate that this was a time of transition.

In its beginnings, St. Paul's School simply meant Dr. Henry Augustus Coit, who might well have said, *L'École? C'est moi.* He had derived his ideals from Dr. William Augustus Muhlenberg of St. Paul's College, Flushing, which he had attended; and of a number

who in various places followed the Muhlenberg tradition, Dr. Coit gave it its fullest and most permanent embodiment. Dr. Muhlenberg's school was a *family* of boys, of which he was "school-father," the spiritual guide, friend, and father-confessor of his "school-sons," not merely schoolmaster; and everything was dominated by his own personality. He had a genius for appraising the moral and mental value of external surroundings, knew the use of color and music in young lives, was an artist in his use of religious services, and although there was no talk about "psychology" in his day, he knew all about boys' souls and how to get at them. What Dr. Muhlenberg was at St. Paul's on Long Island, Dr. Coit was at St. Paul's in New Hampshire. There were differences; but the type was the same. Dr. Muhlenberg had greater æsthetic development, and was a musician; Dr. Coit was the more scholarly and a brilliant teacher. But in each school the headmaster's personality dominated and left its impress chiefly by giving a standard of spiritual values.

This is possible in a family of fifty, or even a hundred, boys, as it is not in a larger community. No one but Dr. Coit, under whose hand the whole work at St. Paul's had grown from small beginnings, could have exercised omnipresent parental control as long as he did. In my day there were three hundred and fifty boys in the School; and although the Rector did no teaching except of Sacred Studies in the upper Forms,* my impression is that he was to the boys of my day, individually and

* As a IV Former, during the illness of a master, I had him for two months in Virgil. The second and third books of the

collectively, all that he had been during the heroic period of the '60's and '70's; at any rate I have always seemed wholly to understand the particular brand of loyalty belonging to St. Paul's boys of the first generation. During the last seven or eight years of his life, he lost something of his grip of many things; the School was larger; he was physically less vigorous; Mrs. Coit had died. The difference was marked by the difference in the impression he made in the two Chapels. There was no change in himself, but distinct change in the way in which he appeared in the larger environment.

In the Old Chapel he *filled* the place. He had a spiritually dramatic sense, great power of conveying emotional impressions, and by tensity of his personal devotion, permeated and controlled the congregation. His power was like that of the conductor of an orchestra, who indulges in little or no movement and whose eyes seldom leave his score, yet who dominates his musicians by tensity of feeling for the music itself. So Dr. Coit, whether he himself were conducting the service or not, could compel attention to its meaning and lead in devotion. He read exquisitely with dramatic interpretation that in no way suggested striving for effect.* He also led the singing, not audibly as Dr. Muhlenberg would have done, but visibly. His lips moved reverently

Aeneid which we read with him stand out vividly as no other classics I read in school.

* Fine reading is almost a lost art. The only one who in recent years has seemed to me to have something of the reverent artistry I recall in Dr. Coit, and a few others whom I remember in my youth, is Dr. Houghton of the Transfiguration, New York.

and intelligently, repeating the words of the hymn, the sentiment of which he deeply felt; as a "well-tuned cymbal," he stimulated the "loud cymbals." Yet I do not think he could sing or had keen appreciation of music apart from associations and its use in expressing religious emotion. Several old St. Paul's boys were once discussing this. We knew we had always *seen* him sing; yet we knew of no one who had ever *heard* him. We were positive, however, that he led the congregation in hymns quite as much as Mr. Knox, though in a different way, if not the choir in anthems! There was no doubt about his leading in the prayers and responses, and from the pulpit he could hold attention and guide thought and feeling, though he read his sermons, always expressed in beautiful and forcible English. As he moved majestically from his stall to the altar, the folds of his long surplice swaying rhythmically, he focussed attention in such a way as to create the feeling that he was leading all to participation in an act of special holiness. Whether in his stall, in the pulpit, or at the altar, he was a centre of energy for the men and boys of his large "household"; his power was concentrated in the Chapel, which, as he often reminded us, was the centre of the School, and its services of the School's life.

It was never the same in the New Chapel. At the time of the consecration he had been crippled by a fall, and had to delegate his natural duties to others. Later, although the New Chapel perpetuated and improved on traditions and customs of the Old, the Doctor, in a stall at one end and making his way to the pulpit by a sort of surreptitious entry from the vestry, never filled and

dominated the larger place as he had the smaller. The stately services in a college chapel have an impressiveness all their own; but they must inevitably lack something of the effect of the more intimate devotions of a big family oratory. In later years I spent five years as Master at St. Paul's and have many cherished associations with the Chapel of St. Peter and St. Paul (New); but I have always been thankful that my own school-days were spent in St. Paul's Chapel (Old) with all that that signifies of coming more closely under the spell of Dr. Henry Coit.*

When my mother took me to St. Paul's, she said to Dr. Coit, "We have done the best we could for Fred, and now we leave him entirely to you." He replied, "I wish all parents sent their sons in the same way." I always felt that the Doctor understood me perfectly and took a special interest in me—every St. Paul's boy thought precisely the same!—and could always go to him quite naturally and trustfully. Yet I do not remember that I often saw him alone except during my VI Form year, when, as head-editor of the *Horae Scholasticae*, I had to submit copy for his inspection,

* I have more special associations with the Old Chapel at St. Paul's School than with any other church-building. There I was confirmed by Bishop Niles of New Hampshire on Ascension Day, 1885, kneeling at the Epistle end of the altar; there I made my first Communion shortly after on the last Sunday of term, kneeling second from the end of the kneeling-pace on the Gospel side; there I was ordained priest by Bishop Niles on July 1, 1896, with Mr. Parker (afterward Bishop of New Hampshire) preaching the sermon; and there on the following Sunday I for the first time celebrated Holy Communion.

and when I read with him three books of New Testament Greek.* Yet of all the personal influences in my life the one that has counted for most has been that of Dr. Henry Coit.

I have no distinct recollection of his sermons or of details in his instructions for Confirmation, although I have never forgotten his catechisms which we memorized. His influence tended to create not so much definite intellectual convictions as deep moral impressions. These, however, were always directly associated with the great simple Christian truths; and to the teaching at St. Paul's I owe fixed points of view on religious matters. From Dr. Coit I had foundations on which only one sort of superstructure was possible, outlines which could only be filled in in particular sorts of ways. On the great things he was clear and insistent, on details vague; many things which formed part of his teaching were not things he definitely stated so much as things he permitted, or even compelled one, to infer. The chief impressions which he left on my mind and conscience, or deepened if they existed already, were those which would, I think, be recognized as central in his teaching by any of the old St. Paul's boys. They may be summarized under three heads.

1. *The Constant Presence of Our Lord.*—That Our Lord is a Divine Person was impressed in an unmistakable way. He did not speak of Him as One remote, an historical character whose humanity was so beautiful that it might be called "divine," or as an incongruous

* To supposed intimacy with him, however, I owed the honor of being the first member of the Cadmean Society. The

adjunct to the Almighty Father, as is not uncommon even among instructed churchmen. He was the one great constant Reality, the one Person Who could be really counted on all the time; not simply One Whom he talked about in Sacred Studies and sermons, but, we firmly believed, One Whom he talked to during the many hours we knew he spent in the Chapel, carrying us into the Divine presence by his constant intercessions for us. His insistence on prayer treated it, not as a persistent begging of favors, but as soul-satisfying intercourse with the one all-loving Person. A man, not an alumnus of the School, once gave his impression of a typical St. Paul's boy. He told of one on an ocean steamer in collision, when it was thought the ship might sink any minute, who had been asked what his thoughts were. The man said, "I could think of nothing but the last words of the *Te Deum*, 'Lord, in Thee have I trusted; let me never be confounded.'" Dr. Coit would certainly have recognized that as representing the spirit he sought to develop, if not create.

2. *The Church as the Sphere of Our Lord's Activity.* —I have no clear recollection of anything Dr. Coit said about the Church; but he left the impression that, if the one thing most worth while was contact with our Lord, the only way this was possible, or at any rate the

founder, Marcus Reynolds, one day seized me in the "Vale of Thermopylæ," a passage back of the Study, saying, "You've got to do something. I want to start a literary society; and as you aren't afraid of the Doctor, you've got to ask permission." Thus the Cadmean started. I remember that the Doctor suggested as motto *Per minora majora*, which I liked very much; but the other boys preferred *Sapientia est opes*, devised by Niel Gray.

most satisfactory, was in the life of the Church. Certainly the religious teaching of St. Paul's gave some conception of the Church as Our Lord's Body, introducing into "heavenly places." We knew nothing of discussions about it, but felt it in operation. Dr. Coit was one whose sole interest in life was to bring souls in touch with God; and to him the Church was everything. We heard no talk of priests; but if ever there was one *naturaliter sacerdotalis*, it was he. I never heard him speak of ecclesiastical differences. Being curious about such things, I hoped that when he came in his Confirmation instructions to the Holy Catholic Church in the Creed, he would explain why we should be Episcopalians rather than Presbyterians or Roman Catholics. I was disappointed that he said nothing of these things; but he certainly left us with New Testament thoughts about the Church, and with the impression that by baptism we were incorporated into the Catholic Church, which for us was represented by the Episcopal Church in which we were being trained. Everything tended to make us devoted to this. The religious life at St. Paul's was inspired by an ideal which seemed to leave nothing to be desired. It was itself proof and justification of what it was supposed to represent. Dr. Coit moved on a lofty plane from which he viewed the ordinary course of things with weariness, sadness, impatience, and disdain, showing a prophet's fiery defiance of the world and worldliness in the Church. Though painfully conscious of general failure among churchmen to live up to their principles, he never doubted that the principles were in the Church and behind him in spite of failures in prac-

tice. The very loftiness of his ideals made him depressed at these: but his consciousness of the holiness of his aspirations, of the consecration of his aims for education and pastoral care, the undoubted fact that for the work he had in hand there was no better available substitute, would have convinced him that he was doing the work of Our Lord in His Holy Catholic Church, as it did all those who knew his work and could gauge its value.

3. *Holy Communion as the Central Fact in the Church's Life.*—If the one great thing was to be in union with Christ, and this was made possible in the Church, we were not left in doubt at St. Paul's as to how most definitely this was to be. Communion with the Holy One was through Holy Communion. We went to chapel every morning, three times on Sunday, had prayers in the various houses every evening, and " Sunday Evening Hymn " in the Big Study. All these services were interesting and inspiring because admirably planned, brief and brisk, with telling use of aptly chosen hymns. In spite of habitual grumbling about " too much church," the boys liked them. The Chapel was packed for voluntary services in Lent. But with all these services, the most thoughtless small boy was not left in any doubt as to which of all of them was of chief and unique importance. Only communicants were present for the whole of the Communion Service; but the whole School was made to feel that this was the supreme privilege. There were celebrations of the Communion on Sundays, Saints' Days, and oftener during Lent. All communicants on the place were expected to receive once a month; and on the Saturday evening preceding the

monthly Communion, there was devotional preparation at "Communicants' Meeting." At this time, Dr. Coit was at his best. He raised a feeling of great expectancy. Our Lord was coming to us. We were to receive Him at the Eucharist in the early morning. Here was to be an experience of "eternal life." In all the arrangements for our Communions, we were hedged about, so that there might be a deepening of spiritual impressions. We were taught that to receive monthly represented the minimum of good practice; that we ought to regard weekly reception as normal; and that the ideal for very devout people was to receive every day. As a VI Former at St. Paul's, I think I tried to go to Communion every Sunday; at any rate from 1890 I expected never to miss a Sunday or Saint's Day.

It was by Dr. Coit that I was taught to believe in the Real Presence. I do not think he ever spoke of it in any technical sort of way: but from the time of my Confirmation, I accepted it as matter of course that no member of the Catholic Church could think of the Eucharist in any other way than as mode and guarantee of the Presence of Our Lord Himself. All our instructions as to reverent approach to the altar and reception emphasized this. I often think of the altar of a church as in a blaze of glory typifying the Divine Presence; but the one in which I have most often imagined this sacramental Shekinah is that of the Old Chapel at St. Paul's School.*

* In a letter I had from Dr. Coit while I was in Oxford, dated January 4, 1893, is a characteristic reference to Holy Communion.

"I wish I could see you in my study an hour or two this

To St. Paul's also I owe a vivid sense of the significance of the Christian Year. Not only was I there at an impressionable age; but I have never lived in any place where Church seasons were observed with so much system and so much sense. The note of the season was always sounded, largely by use of hymns and colors, in such a way as to have its full educational value. So vivid was the consciousness of the Church Year at St. Paul's, that, in later years in Oxford and theological seminaries where the same sort of thing was to be expected, I felt the lack of something that had existed at St. Paul's. Dr. Muhlenberg had the instinct for ecclesiastical "settings"; Dr. Coit gave them deeper significance: but many people with identical convictions and aims lack their ability to give them effective expression.

Our Lord, the Church, the Eucharist, as indicating an order of thought and experience whereby salvation comes to individual souls, would seem to me to summarize the teaching of Dr. Henry Coit. In looking back, it seems to me that this is the substance of what I gained from the religious teaching at St. Paul's; and that subsequent training and experience have been merely

evening. I know that you are keeping uppermost that spiritual self-discipline without which our mental training and acquirements are comparatively fruitless. I think the simple attendance on the Blessed Sacrament, week by week, and forming the habit of careful preparation and frequent reception, remembering into Whose Presence we come, and for what we hang upon His Grace, will do more for stable peace and true growth in moral strength than any other means whatever. Why should *we* not have joy and peace in believing? And there is no fear that we shall overestimate His love to us."

the development of it. I have not been a good example of the St. Paul's spirit; but from the School I carried away these ideals as a standard, which, in spite of my personal failures, I have never lost.

Dr. Coit influenced me as no other when I was a boy: he did not influence me much as a young man, although I was three years a master in the School during his lifetime. His mission in life was that of "apostle to boys," for whom he was "an external conscience," and for whose spiritual welfare he was so deeply concerned that he felt only good could come to them by following his admonitions with obedient deference. If, as they grew older, they showed signs of thinking and acting for themselves, he seemed to distrust this as a sign of straying from the ways of safety. He did not seem to realize that his boys ever grew up; and, as he was at his best in his great family of deferential boys and young men, so he was not wholly at his ease or at his best in the world of men elsewhere. There was no reason why he should have been. His mission in life was to the boys of St. Paul's. But many of the most loyal sons of St. Paul's found that the Doctor did not help them as much as others with problems of college and later life. He preferred to have his boys listen rather than speak; hence it was not possible to have that sort of full and frank discussion with him that a young man frequently wishes to have with an elder. The Doctor would be very likely to say, "Yes, my dear, I know exactly how you feel," and then proceed to lay down law—very excellent law—about things irrelevant, allowing no interruption and giving a gracious dismissal before one had had a

chance to say what he had really come for. I never lost anything of my devotion to him; but, as older boy and young master at St. Paul's, when I felt the need of talking freely about personal problems and puzzles, I never went to the Doctor, although I knew he would have expected it, but turned rather to Dr. Joseph Coit, Mr. Parker, and Mr. Stanley Emery.

Only one thing in my subsequent connection with the School has any bearing on the purpose of this narrative. In 1906, when Dr. Henry Ferguson was Rector, I was elected Vice-rector with succession to the Rectorship on Dr. Ferguson's retirement. I did not wish the place for myself nor myself for the place, but at first felt bound to accept for two reasons. Like many others I wished to see the Rectorship go to an old boy in Orders who would be loyal to the Coit tradition, and the Trustees seemed likely to choose no other who would accept; and, as an old Ferguson scholar, I wished to do anything that Dr. Ferguson asked of me. For several months I had in imagination to try to relate myself to the manifold interests and activities of the School and to think of ending my days as Rector of St. Paul's. But although I was interested in all aspects of the life and work, I saw that the one thing I was keen about was the chapel services; and that I could not view with enthusiasm any work which was not distinctly and exclusively that of the Church. Assuming that I might have adapted myself to the varied demands of the position, I did not want to abandon what seemed obviously my own special line of work. For the first time, I recognized clearly what for me was the "stimulus of

narrowness," and said to Dr. Ferguson, "I am an ecclesiastic through and through." He was very kind, said the supposed settlement of the question of the succession had incidentally solved several minor problems for him, and gave full permission to me to recall the acceptance.

I have spoken of this because it led to my recognition, for the first time, that my standard of interests, if not of values, is strictly ecclesiastical—ecclesiastical as distinct from intellectual, moral or spiritual. As predominantly interested in things of *the Church*, "I am ecclesiastic, through and through."

CHAPTER III

OXFORD

In 1891, I went to Oxford, was for three years in residence in Keble College, took my B.A. degree in the Honour School of Theology in 1894, and lived for a year, as a graduate, at the Pusey House. The four years in England were the happiest of my life. All my associations were of the pleasantest sort, their beginnings resulting from letters of introduction given me by Mr. Parker of St. Paul's, an old Keble man, whose footsteps I followed throughout my training. In Keble, I owed most to Dr. Walter Lock, afterwards Warden, who was my tutor. His advice about courses was of the best; his Mods. lectures on the Gospels in Keble, and Theology lectures on St. Paul's Epistles in Oriel, were among the best I attended; above all, his patient criticism of the crude papers I submitted to him was the most helpful I have ever received. I had a very long lecture-list, taking many courses which interfered with necessary work for Schools: but I was keen to make the most of every sort of opportunity, and, on the whole, was satisfied that I had done so. I have never cared so much for any place as for Oxford, every stone and turn of which I came to know well; and for that reason I have not cared to go back to it, a ghost out of place, haunting the scene of youthful hopefulness and activity.

Oxford gave form and substance to the religious

teaching of St. Paul's. As a resident in Keble College and the Pusey House, I lived in the concentrated atmosphere of the Oxford Movement, regarding Keble and Pusey with filial loyalty as the embodiments of sound Church principles and sound learning, and hearing and knowing much of those who were their most direct successors. Although Dr. Liddon died in 1890, I have a feeling of having almost known him, as I lived with those who were constantly quoting him and speaking of him so intimately, that he seemed to be just around the corner. In both Keble and the Pusey House were the books of his library, with many of his pungent comments on the margins. I was especially interested to discover in the Pusey House library proof-copies of his Bamptons sent to Dr. Pusey, with the latter's comments and letters about them, and amazed to learn that Pusey did not approve of them as "Germanizing" in tendency.

In the early '90's, however, the men most looked up to by High Church undergraduates were the writers in *Lux Mundi;* who were regarded as constituting an inner circle of the elect, the most stable element in the Church of England's present, and safest guarantee of its future. I knew none of them well except Dr. Lock and later Dr. Ottley, but had a slight acquaintance with several of the others, was in the way of seeing and hearing much of all of them, and followed their books, sermons, and lectures with avidity. I attended courses given by Moberly and Ottley, heard Illingworth deliver his Bamptons on *Personality,* and for three years never missed a sermon or lecture given by Gore. Not having

had any training in philosophy, I did not know enough to take in the subtler points in their theology and apologetic; their general attitude toward religious and ecclesiastical questions I did ultimately make my own. As an undergraduate, I was keenly observant and attentive, though slow-witted and ruminative, taking no part whatever in the discussions of select gatherings, junior common-rooms and the Union, whereby young Oxford forms opinions by processes of debate. I was simply a good listener, making the most of opportunities. I am bound to emphasize the *Lux Mundi* aspect of my education, since no better account can be given of a young man's ideals than by indicating the older men whom he admires. The old spell was all brought back recently by reading the *Life of J. R. Illingworth.* I remember having the feeling that the annual gatherings at Longworth, of which I had been told, represented a chief safeguard of Christian civilization!

The most influential of the men of this circle was Charles Gore, the Principal of the Pusey House. From him chiefly, I think, I learned to believe in the necessity of relating all things to the doctrine of the Incarnation; in the Church of England as the best exponent of Liberal Catholicism; and in the untenability of Roman Catholic claims. His teaching about Inspiration I accepted on authority. It always seemed to me that he was best represented by his Bamptons, on the Incarnation, and by his St. Asaph lectures, for which I especially cared, on *The Mission of the Church.**

* In later years I have always found all his utterances supremely helpful except that I could not assent to some things in *The Body of Christ.*

In 1901 I was asked to write a paper for the Middlesex Archdeaconry in Connecticut on *Religious Influences in Oxford.* I quote from this, written at a time when my recollections and impressions were more vivid than they are now. In this was a passage about Gore.

"No one else seemed to have so profound a grasp of the different sides of essential Christian truth; no one else seemed to have genuine sympathy with so many kinds of people; no one else could do so much to rid men of intellectual difficulties concerning the faith; no one else could make so direct an appeal to the consciences of young men. This was perhaps the more remarkable in that Gore was the chosen figure-head of a party, the uncompromising champion of the definite theology of the Creeds. First and foremost, he would have been regarded as the exponent of conservative principles. But he was also in support of all principles of progress. Without claiming to be a specialist in any department of literary criticism or scientific research, he was able, through possession of faculties highly trained in schools of philosophy and theology and by unremitting study of persons and things, to indicate to puzzled minds standpoints from which to view different departments of knowledge, and the general considerations and methods whereby difficulties might be remedied. He had a rare faculty of indicating *proportion,* the relative importance of things and the unexpected dovetailing of apparently conflicting truths. He had unique influence in saving and strengthening the faith of many waverers.

"The burden of all his teaching was the Incarnation. This had been the subject of his lectures in the School of Theology and of his Bamptons, and like most of his col-

leagues, he was ever insisting that the truth of this is the basis of all else. His concern with other questions was always to show how all truths are related to this; in the face of questions raised by scientific research to show that the new knowledge did not compel us to abandon anything really belonging to faith and delivered by revelation. He insisted, of course, strongly on the distinction between essentials and the mass of associations and theories which have grown up around them, many of which have to be abandoned, though the fundamental truths stand every test of time and scrutiny. The actual result of his influence in Oxford was that many men, wrestling with doubts, were made to feel that the results of modern discovery are entirely consistent with historic Christianity, and that we need only time and patience to work out our problems in detail.

"Apart from his intellectual power, he had great moral force felt by those who came in close contact with him. This came from earnestness, humility, and power of intense sympathy. It was this which made him, without attractions of presence or manner, a great preacher. Men were drawn by his obvious genuineness. His exposition of the Scriptures was scholarly, but always simple, 'practical expositions' which were not critical commentaries but devotional studies."

The paper commented at some length on three special characteristics of the Oxford men, comprehensiveness, intellectual humility, and the practical application of Christian principles as shown in the work of the Christian Social Union.

"The first thing is a little hard to express by a single word. Perhaps the nearest equivalent is comprehensive-

ness, using the word with reference to different lines of thought and modes of development; something more than vague sympathy with ideas different from one's own, something more than an effort to understand different standpoints; a definite, determined effort, not merely to understand, but actually to represent several schools of thought instead of one, to focus *all* lines of development. . . . I remember in 1893 a sermon by Dean Wickham of Lincoln, delivered not long after the publication of the Lives of Dr. Pusey and Dean Stanley. He said in substance: 'We have all lately read the biographies of two great Oxford professors, who in their lifetime were much in conflict. I wonder whether we were not all impressed both by the fact that they had much more in common than they knew, and that we have much in common with both of them.' That was a characteristic Oxford comment. Men wished to feel, 'Dr. Pusey and Dean Stanley may have been often at loggerheads; but I belong to the parties of both of them, and both of them to some extent belong to me.'

"Another notable characteristic was intellectual humility, something always seen in men of the highest type; the absence of that dogmatism which results from isolation, from the little learning that is dangerous, and from sheer untroubled ignorance. They were always ready to recognize the limitations of our knowledge, not in the least afraid to say 'I don't know,' not in the least afraid to admit the existence of difficulties. There was a fearless facing of facts, and on many subjects habitual suspense of judgment. . . . They gave little satisfaction to young and impatient persons who wished to 'know it all,' or to old and easily disturbed persons who wished to 'hang it all.' They did not satisfy craving for short and easy solutions, for in pronouncing on disputed points, they often got no further than 'Very probably, *but*.' Those who wished for only one side of all

questions, on which they could be comfortably shelved, would be irritated by reminder that there are usually two sides, and driven to desperation by suggestion of three or four. Oxford is not a place conducive to self-complacency, though it is calculated to inspire a deep zeal for truth, and to connect this with religion. *Dominus illuminatio mea.*"

There were also comments on the preaching of Oxford men, especially those then leaders in London, Scott Holland, Newbolt, Gore, Winnington-Ingram, then at Oxford House, Bethnal Green, and Lang.

"The one word that best describes their preaching is *directness*. Its aim is manifestly and intensely practical. They succeed in talking directly to you, even though you be an inconspicuous unit in a congregation of thousands. There is no attempt at showy rhetoric or elocution. Language is simple, often homely; the eloquence, if there is any, that which comes of earnestness. Not that there is absence of profound thought and close reasoning; none show more. . . . A sermon, or even short address, is looked on as bringing too serious a responsibility to be undertaken 'unadvisedly or lightly,' as a sacrament of truth."

Of all the teachers in Oxford, however, the one to whom I probably owe most was Dr. William Bright, Canon of Christ Church, and Regius Professor of Ecclesiastical History. My decision to go to Oxford was made after an interview with Father Hall (afterward Bishop of Vermont) in Boston, in which, among other pieces of good advice, he told me to be sure and attend Dr. Bright's lectures on the General Councils. The course took three years. Fortunately it was beginning

in the Michaelmas Term of 1891, so that during the whole of my undergraduate course I was making under Dr. Bright's auspices a progress from Nicæa to Chalcedon. This course was my favorite above all others; I took special pleasure in doing written work which Dr. Bright criticized; and was more than pleased to have him say that I had been "one of my most assiduous pupils."

I had always been interested in history. As a small boy, my two grandfathers encouraged me to study the history of the United States: and the interest thus roused led me to read every book on American history which either of them possessed. At St. Paul's, I had special liking for the history classes, especially the English History; and my first article in print, a prize "miscellaneous article" for the *Horae*, was "A Dream" of the Athenian acropolis in the time of Pericles. Of Church History I knew nothing, although Bishop Kip's *Double Witness* had given me some notion of the position of the Episcopal Church, and some question or other which puzzled me had resulted in giving an impression that in religious matters a safe person to follow was St. Augustine! This may have been due to the fact that Dr. Coit referred occasionally with great respect to "St. Austin," that he had given me a translation of Augustine's *Confessions*, and that the school motto was said to be from Augustine.* I may

* *Ea discamus in terris, quorum scientia perseverat in coelis.* I have never been able to discover the source of this in spite of several excursions into Migne for the purpose, nor have others who have made the same quest. The sentiment is to be

have, when I went to Oxford, intended to specialize in Church History: at any rate it proved a favorite study.

In the early '90's, no one in Oxford better represented the patristic ideals of the first Tractarians than Dr. Bright. To him the fathers of the fourth and fifth centuries were the most real of all people, as well as most safe guides for all time. They represented the Catholic Church in which he believed, and it was their spirit which he wished to see perpetuated in England and America. It was not so much that he made them live in his lectures, as that they made him live in all that he undertook. To him the supreme personalities were those of the great Doctors of the Church; the supreme duty patient defence of the Faith and insistence on the interdependence of Belief and Life. The compactness and compression of his books give little notion of the vivacity of his lectures. The most characteristic is his *Lessons from the Lives of Three Great Fathers;* but to understand him best, one must read his poems, especially the hymns. The moral of all his teaching was the duty of loyalty to the Faith as measure of devotion to our Lord. Hence his special delight in St. Athanasius.

> "Ask we the secret of his strength?
> Ask what his heart believed;—
> The truth in all its breadth and length,
> From Paul and John received:
> What nerved him such a race to run
> Was love to God's eternal Son.

found in various Augustinian treatises; but the exact quotation is elusive.

"'Twas not the mere polemic zeal
For Council or for Creed;
For both he set his face like steel,
To serve the Church's need;
But both were prized for His dear sake
Whose rights were in that strife at stake." *

Dr. Bright's lectures left three chief impressions: (1) the all-importance of firm faith in the Incarnation; (2) the supreme value of the General Councils as expressing the thought and life of the Church; (3) the paramount importance of patristic authority. In all this he rightly represented classic Tractarianism; and to him would probably apply a comment of Dr. Darwell Stone's, that "the Tractarians seem to have read into the formularies of the Church of England that teaching of the ancient Church with which the minds of their leaders were imbued."

A limitation of Dr. Bright's was his concentration of attention on the evidence of patristic literary documents. He ignored much evidence of monuments, local traditions, and existing institutions, which bore directly on subjects he had in hand.† I remember, after reading De Rossi, being dimly conscious that he ought to have made more use of the Catacombs. I learned from his

* *First Exile of St. Athanasius* in *Hymns and Other Verses.*

† "History does not mean only books, manuscripts, documents, scientific historians. It means also the moral personality of empires and kingdoms: the living and ever-accumulating tradition of human action and human knowledge embodied in usages, customs, laws, institutions. All these are witnesses and testify with articulate voice. The history of the Church is the Church itself." Manning: *Religio Viatoris,* p. 79.

Life that he never visited them until 1894! In such work on history as I was able to do in Oxford, I found a useful supplement to Dr. Bright's methods in what could be learned then of the methods of Sir William Ramsay. From his books I gained a first glimpse of the far-reaching importance of monumental archæology.

Although I read much Church History lying outside my " period " for Final Schools, the way in which Dr. Bright made the first four Councils stand out in clear relief led me always to give them disproportionate prominence. While this was doubtless chiefly due to limitations of my own knowledge and vision, I think also it reflected something not uncommon in Tractarian Oxford. Only recently have I become emancipated from the idea that everything most worth while culminated at the Council of Chalcedon; and that the best that can now be done in the Church is to perpetuate Chalcedonian balance of thought, and fifth century methods of discipline and organization. Development was quite legitimate in earlier days; but all change was dangerous innovation after 450. Leo I, falling within the period, was to be received with great respect; Gregory I, coming a little later, was to be scrutinized with suspicion. Although greatly admiring the Eastern Church, I could criticize its stopping short with the Seventh General Council and St. John Damascene as " mummied Christianity," not noticing that an " appeal to antiquity," conceived as complete three centuries earlier, was something more mummied still; and while disparaging Protestant appeal to Scripture, failed to detect that there was little difference between a leap

from St. Paul to Luther with eyes shut, and one with eyes open from St. Augustine to Keble! Yet something of that sort is the tacit assumption of those who confine attention to "the undivided Church" and the Oxford Movement, as many Anglicans have done.

From Dr. Bright I derived chiefly my belief that the claims of the modern papacy are unhistorical. He emphasized everything in conciliar history that tells against them; and, as I came to see later, unconsciously failed to give due weight to considerations on the other side. Not that he would have been consciously unfair; but he laid all stress on a point on which he felt the conciliar evidence to be luminously convincing. His general line of criticism, summarized in *The Roman See in the Early Church*, was that of Father Puller's *Primitive Saints and the See of Rome*, and of Denney's *Papalism*. The early primacy of the Roman Bishops was, of course, admitted; but in the early centuries the papacy, as it later existed, was conspicuous by its absence. The most complete confutation of the modern claims was to be found in the history of the early Roman Church itself. The Vatican Council of 1870, no less than the Forged Decretals, had falsified history and cut under any theory of development such as Newman's. Yet he left the impression that there was nothing very dangerous, despite the twenty-eighth Canon of Chalcedon, in acquiescing in all that was claimed by St. Leo and acknowledged by St. Augustine.

From 1894-95, the year I was living in Pusey House, dates an especial interest in all that pertains to the Eastern Orthodox Churches. Both from books read

at that time and from some lectures on Russia given by Mr. W. J. Birkbeck, I became strongly convinced of the prime importance of an understanding between Easterns and Anglicans, and of the bearing of the existence and history of the Eastern Churches on the validity of papal claims. I owed even more of this interest to the conversation of Dr. F. E. Brightman, in whose room I spent many evenings between supper and Compline. He had just come from the East and was correcting proof for his book on *Eastern Liturgies*. Without recalling definite conversations, I know that from this time date my vivid impressions of the solidity of the Anglican position as analogous to that of the Greek Church. Dr. Brightman was admittedly one of the most learned men in Oxford, and not in liturgical subjects alone. Without knowing enough to take in all the things I heard him and others discuss, I gained at this time deeper impressions of the bearing on all Christian problems of the history and experience of the Eastern Churches; of the importance of great principles of historic ceremonial as distinct from the fads of petty ritualists; of the inferiority of things modern to things more ancient in Rome; and of the incongruity of what Archbishop Benson had dubbed "the Italian Mission" in England. To Dr. Brightman I owed useful advice as to use of time on a first visit to Rome, for which he gave me several letters of introduction including one to the Archbishop of Nicozia, and an interest in mosaics which led later to visits to Ravenna and Palermo.

In Oxford, I frequented many churches besides Keble

Chapel, was often at the Cathedral, at St. Mary's for 'Varsity sermons, occasionally at New College and Magdalen for Evensong, very often at St. Barnabas'. Every vacation I spent several weeks in London, about eighteen months in all during four years, and came to know many London churches well. I was most often at St. Paul's Cathedral, so regularly for Evensong one winter at Westminster Abbey that the verger assigned me a special stall, occasionally at the Temple Church and St. Alban's, Holborn, very often at All Saints', Margaret Street, and St. John's, Red Lion Square, which I liked especially. I was at St. Paul's frequently on high festivals, a number of times for oratorios, at the memorial service for the Duke of Clarence in 1892, and at a consecration of Bishops (Colchester and Coventry) in 1895. I was in London on the day of the marriage of the present King and Queen (Duke and Duchess of York), and beside all the royalties saw three Archbishops of Canterbury (Benson, Temple, and Davidson) driving by in the Archbishop's carriage.

At different times I made excursions to all the cathedral-towns in south England except Chichester and Truro, and to several in the north, staying in all of them long enough not only to see the cathedrals as sights, but to feel them in use and let the historic associations sink in. In them and the many old parish-churches which I visited, continuously in use in mediæval and modern times, I felt to the full the suggestion made by these buildings, in whose history the upheavals of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries were but episodes, of unbroken continuity in the English

Church. This haunting of cathedrals, college chapels, and other old churches, with all their weight of association, gave an impression of the majesty and strength of the Church of England, which formed the background of conviction of the mission of Anglicanism for the whole English-speaking world. All hopes for the future took the form of wishes for what Archbishop Alexander referred to as

> "An Oxford of a more majestic growth;
> A Rome that sheds no blood and makes no slave;
> The perfect flower and quintessence of both,
> More reverent science, faith by far more brave."

Knowledge of the English Church came in pleasantest ways, through observation of many things in the Church at their best, and through contact with some who were special champions of Anglican claims to Catholicity. The man whose life and character seemed to me the best vindication of these in recent years was Bishop King of Lincoln. I never saw him but a few times; at Keble on St. Mark's Day, 1892, the centennial of Keble's birth, when he came to dedicate the Liddon Chapel, and at St. Mary's; but I heard much of his work in Cuddesdon and Oxford from those who had been under his influence, and later of his episcopate. The modern Church of England has no greater glory than to have produced such a saint. He embodies the finest flower and fruit of Anglican piety, and exhibits clearly the Tractarian ideal, "In quietness and confidence shall be your strength."

My education, like all Gaul, is divided into three parts, St. Paul's, Oxford, and Shepton Beauchamp. Shepton Beauchamp is a small village in Somerset, four miles from Ilminster, with a glimpse of Glastonbury Tor twenty miles to the north. Its claim to distinction is that of a well-worked country parish in which the principles of the Oxford Movement have been consistently translated into action. It is the home of the Coles family to whom its unique features are due. The Reverend James Stratton Coles, who was "squarson" —squire and parson—had made St. Michael's, Shepton Beauchamp, in many ways a model parish, when he was succeeded as Rector by his son, the Reverend Vincent Stratton Stuckey Coles, who brought to his work an irresistible personality and experience gained in Oxford, Cuddesdon, and Wantage under Dr. Butler. He built the Rectory for himself and the Vicar of Barrington, a village two miles off, and opened his house to friends among the clergy in need of a rest and among Oxford undergraduates who wished a place to read during vacations. The household at Shepton Rectory often consisted of four or five clergy and four or five younger men, living in atmosphere of regular devotion, systematic hard work, and, at times of recreation, what is perhaps best described as intense cheerfulness! Life was *ordered* with a view to providing in the most thorough way for the pastoral care of the people of the village and for the prosecution of every one's special work with energy and good spirits.

When I went to England in 1891 I had letters to Mr. Stuckey Coles, then Chaplain of Pusey House of

which he was subsequently Principal, and to his successor at Shepton, the Reverend Arthur Lethbridge, from Mr. Parker, himself an "Old Sheptonian." I first saw the place on Michaelmas, the patronal festival, when after a beautiful choral Eucharist in the gayly trimmed old church, the whole village repaired to the fields about "the House" for games, dinner served in a great tent, and dances on the green lasting until late in the evening. As long as I live, Michaelmas will always bring memories of Shepton. During four years I went to Shepton several times each year, twice spending the "Long Vac" there, and must have lived there in all eighteen or twenty months.

There I learned what clerical life and parochial work should be. I have never lived up to the Shepton ideal, but have never lost it. After seeing the ordered life of the clergy-house, the careful provision for services, instructions, pastoral calls, rescue work, and healthful amusements of the small community, all arranged with such consecrated common sense, it was impossible ever to be satisfied with the average clergyman's life of intense domesticity interrupted by Sunday services and many social calls. The standard was emphatically that of *priests*, representing the influence of Cuddesdon, Wantage, and the Society of the Resurrection, given a unique flavor by the Rector and Vicar, to say nothing of the frequent visits of Canon Coles.

There were four or five Eucharists a week; daily Matins and Evensong in church; Terce, Sext, and Compline in the Oratory; all services simple and devotional, with hearty congregational singing of a sort I have

never heard elsewhere except in the parish-church at Hawarden and in St. Martin's, New Bedford; and all the work and recreation of the village made to centre about these, so that the church was made the actual centre of village life. Here I had my first experiences as server and as assistant in various matters about the church; occasionally I went for similar purposes to Barrington; and for two summers I helped a neighboring Vicar by reading Lessons and Litany for him in his churches at Lopen and Kingstone. The familiarity with details which I learned in the church at Shepton and elsewhere in England, was of great use to me after I was ordained.

I did much tramping about the country, visiting the Somersetshire churches with their fine Hamstone towers, occasionally taking a day or two off from reading for longer tramps, on which I explored the country between Shepton and the English Channel at Lyme Regis, the neighborhood of Glastonbury and Wells, south Devon about Exeter, and north Devon as far west as Clovelly and Hartland Head. With a college friend who made rubbings of monumental brasses, I went farther afield; in Gloucestershire, doing Gloucester, Tewkesbury, the Golden Valley, Stroud, and Cirencester; at another time the Thames Valley about Windsor; at another the Valley of the Wye, south from Hereford. On the longer walks I was made to think much of the place of the English Church in English life. I think I fully understand the feeling of Englishmen that the Church in possession of the ancient homes of English Christianity must be, in spite of everything,

the Catholic Church of the land. On the short tramps in the afternoon, I could think over what I had been reading; and I associate many lessons in Theology with the fields and lanes about Shepton.

When I was ordained priest at St. Paul's in 1896 Mr. Parker preached the sermon, as he did twelve years later at my consecration as Bishop, when he was Bishop-Coadjutor of New Hampshire. In conclusion he said:

"We have had the inspiration of the same life in this place as boys and men; this Chapel is full of tender associations for both of us; and we have both had before us as an example the life of the great Christian Priest (Dr. Coit) whose memorials are behind us and before us, whose example and whose help have really aided both of us to understand what the ideal of the Priesthood is: but somehow my mind turns from all these associations to those which we alone have in common, and carry me to that quiet Somersetshire village, where as theological students we have seen God's grace and God's power as it shows itself in consecrated lives. To us there came our lesson of what our work is to be, and of the spirit in which it must be done. We have lived with men who regard their office as a mighty gift and commission from Jesus Christ, and who show by their lives and their work the power that comes from the trusts committed to them duly and fearlessly exercised; we have seen how all natural gifts may be developed and extended by the Divine commission which sanctifies and increases them: we have seen administrative talents, simple, humble work in obscure places, rare and unusual mental gifts, eloquence, great learning, scholarship, enthusiasm, quiet, dogged persistence—all blessed and made almost

new gifts by being carried to Jesus Christ and devoted to His service. And above all we have been able to see that power and developed gifts come from the personal service of Christ and personal union with Him, which the official commission of the Priesthood cannot supply and which it must be our constant effort to maintain and to cherish.

" The scenes amid which we are to live are likely to be very different from the quiet village with its gray stone cottages pressing close to the old Church with its high square tower and crowded churchyard: and we wish them to be different, for we have our work in our own dear country: but the spirit and the zeal and the source of power must be the same, the power of Christ working through us, the power of Christ developing all our natural abilities, the power of Christ drawing us closer and closer to Himself all our life."

There could be no better summary and suggestion of the good influences under which I was privileged to live during the years of preparation for ministerial work. They may be illustrated by extracts from two letters.

Dr. Henry Coit wrote me (April 23, 1892) when I had been admitted Candidate for Holy Orders:

" The first step has been taken towards that Blessed Work which will make your life, if you are true and faithful, a consecrated one. No life can be more wretched than that of a lukewarm, worldly or self-indulgent priest, none more delightful than that of one all the wishes and desires of whose will centre in what God has commanded."

Mr. Coles wrote to me from Oxford (March 8, 1895) on the eve of my ordination as Deacon:

"Did you ever think that our Lord went from the Cross 'to preach to the spirits that were in prison'? And this is a description of all our preaching more or less. The words with which He went are summing up of the past, and consecration of the future, 'Father, into Thy hands I commend My spirit.' What better words can you have in mind as you pass into the unknown life of the ministry?"

CHAPTER IV

MINISTERIAL WORK

During the autumn of 1894, while I was living at the Pusey House, I studied for the first time the Constitution and Canons of the Protestant Episcopal Church. At that time there was a "Canon on Ritual" (shortly afterward repealed) which forbade among other things "any act of adoration of or toward the Elements in the Holy Communion, such as bowings, prostrations, genuflexions," which "symbolized erroneous or doubtful Doctrine." I was not demonstrative in my habits of ritual and do not recall that the Canon seemed to forbid such slight reverential inclinations as I was then accustomed to make: but as it seemed to imply that there was to be no special adoration of Our Lord in the Eucharist, it seemed to place the doctrine of the Real Presence in the category of "erroneous or doubtful" according to the standards of the Protestant Episcopal Church. If so, I doubted whether I could be ordained; at any rate I felt bound to make a declaration of my belief on these points to the Standing Committee of New Hampshire, who were being asked to recommend me for ordination, and to my Bishop. I have no copy of the declaration. It was brief, affirming belief in the Real Presence of Our Lord in the Eucharist, and in the consequent duty of Eucharistic Adoration, intended to conform with the teaching of Keble, and expressed in terms approved by Canon Coles and Mr. Lethbridge.

I wrote first to Dr. Joseph Coit, one of the New Hampshire Examining Chaplains, and had from him a very careful letter (Dec. 4, 1894):

"Whether certain of the framers of this Canon meant to prohibit any 'bowings, prostrations,' etc., no matter with what intention done, and to forbid every act of devotion except those prescribed in the rubrics, is a question with which we need not trouble our consciences. The facts to determine are, What did *the Church* intend to prohibit by this Canon? How have fair-minded and instructed men understood and used it? What has been the actual interpretation and application of it by the Bishops and Authorities concerned with it? I think that all these questions can be answered fairly and truthfully so as to show that the Canon is to be taken as forbidding the teaching or symbolizing of *Transubstantiation* by ritual or devotional acts. I understand by Transubstantiation the common controversial meaning, *not* the later and more rational explanations of it by certain Roman theologians."

I had several letters on the subject from Canon Bright, whom I had consulted.

Torquay, January 10, 1895.

"Literally it goes beyond the terms of our English 'Declaration of Kneeling.' At the same time I cannot imagine that the belief in the Sacramental Presence notoriously tenable (to say the least) in the English Church, is advisedly proscribed in the American. Bishop Hall himself, to name no other prelate, would be a living confutation of such a supposition. And if that belief is tenable, so that no Standing Committee (abnormal, in one sense, as the powers of that body seem to be) would be upheld in presenting a clergyman who avowed it, then reverence towards

the consecrated Elements as vehicle of that Presence, is natural and (so to speak) logical. One does not know—that is, I do not—whether, if a Bishop thought a certain practice lawful under the Canons, and the Standing Committee thought it unlawful, the Committee could force the Bishop to proceed against the clergyman accused. If they could, I think the name 'Episcopal' would be a very inaccurate designation of the American Church: but until I know the contrary, I shall believe that the Bishop could not be so coerced."

January 11.

"Such simple acts of reverence as you contemplate seem to be the inevitable result of a belief in the Sacramental Presence, and not at all to be bound up with, nor implicitly to suggest or promote, either the Roman scholastic theory as to the Presence (however the statement of that theory is to be understood) or any materialistic conception such as popular Romanism has been found to encourage."

January 13.

"My own supposition is that the Canon in question would not be found manageable. And if the American Church has room for Bishop Hall and Bishop Grafton—not to name others—it is pretty sure to have room for you. For you are minded to be loyal to the Anglican formularies—I am using 'Anglican' in a broad sense—with no disingenuous Romanizing side-looks, of which, I fear, we in England have not seen the last, and also with no disposition to take unwarrantable liberties with the law of the Church, such as are too often taken where no Romanizing drift exists from mere æsthetic or antiquarian reasons. To press stringently such a Canon in the *English* Church would be hopeless for the most sanguine Puritan accuser, and I cannot imagine

that what is thus notably out of date with us would be practicable 'across the pool' after your ordination."

Bishop Niles' response after I had made my formal statement was as follows:

Paris, January 28, 1895.

"While I would hold neither myself nor any Standing Committee competent to waive the utterances and rulings of a Canon like that—*any* Canon—I do not suppose that it was intended to oppose any doctrine of the Real Presence which you have been taught. Sure I am that this Church has no thought of ruling out of her ministry them that, regarding the Holy Eucharist, agree with Dr. Pusey, Dr. Liddon, Dr. King (of Lincoln), Dr. Dix and Dr. DeKoven.

"I suppose the Canon to wish to guard against *strained inferences* in the shape of ritual practices from the true doctrine (or, if you please, the sound Theology) of the Holy Eucharist. And it is a wholesome thing to hold one's self herein in much sober restraint. It would not be easy to understand the Communion Office without seeing in it clear recognition of the true, real, objective Presence of our Blessed Lord—a Presence none the less Real if after a spiritual and heavenly manner, 'ineffable,' but, if possible, all the more Real."

As I had frankly expressed myself and the Bishop was satisfied, all scruple was removed. The incident merely confirmed my belief that the doctrine of the Real Presence, with Eucharistic Adoration of Our Lord as a logically consequent duty, was the true doctrine of the Anglican Churches, no matter how many of its members failed to understand it.

The Bishop of New Hampshire spent the winter of

1894-95 in France; and as I had done all work necessary for canonical examinations, and the time of candidacy was completed, he sent for me and arranged for my ordination to the Diaconate in the American Church of the Holy Trinity in Paris. I went into retreat for three days in a Paris hotel (!), taking Newbolt's *Speculum Sacerdotum* as a sort of conductor, and was ordained on the Second Sunday in Lent, March 10, 1895. Immediately after, the Bishop allowed me to go with my family to spend the rest of Lent in Italy. We were three days in Venice, ten days in Florence, three weeks in Rome, keeping a Roman Holy Week and Easter. My first ministerial act was to assist Dr. Nevin at the American Church in Rome (St. Paul's-within-the-Walls) at the early Communion on Easter Day.

Two weeks later, I was in New York, attended a service in memory of Dr. Henry Coit at Calvary Church, and in the House of Prayer, Newark, preached my first sermon, a dreaded ordeal which in the event was not trying, as no one but myself knew that I had never preached before. This sermon, the subject of which was the Unity of the Church, was altogether characteristic of my general tendencies and mode of thought. It outlined all the special things that have occupied my attention in subsequent years.

The opening words were:

"We say in the Apostles Creed that we believe in the Holy Catholic Church, and in the Nicene Creed that we believe One Catholic and Apostolic Church, thereby expressing our belief, if we use the words in their natural and historical sense, in a visible society instituted by Christ

and His Apostles as the covenanted means of bringing men into union with Himself. We believe furthermore that this society is to be perpetual, relying upon our Lord's promises that the gates of hell shall not prevail against it; that His Spirit abides with it and is in it; that He will be with it always."

The discussion of the principle of Unity follows Gore; there is detailed reference to the main divisions of the Christian world; the practical application is a plea for fuller knowledge of Christendom and an avoidance of prejudice with frank recognition of our own limitations. The illustrations of the fact that "unity is in the air" are taken from Pope Leo XIII, Lord Halifax, and Dr. Milligan, a Scotch Presbyterian.

"We may disapprove the methods of the Pope to secure unity; but we cannot honestly withhold admiration for the spirit of the present successor of St. Peter which leads him to seek it. The most conspicuous Bishop in Christendom is setting the rest of Christendom a good example."

"Differences there are; we must know what they are. But we must not be blind to the truths that others hold, and to all the good they practice. . . . With regard to all others, it is plainly our duty to discover and emphasize all we have in common, and to be able to give in all charity plain reasons for what we hold to be Catholic truth. Unity is never promoted by glossing, suppressing, or ignoring, truth. It is because we are so anxious for unity that we are ready to contend for the faith; because we are longing for peace, that we are willing to fight for it. We cannot however claim for ourselves an infallibility we deny to

others. In the cause of unity we are bound first to discover our own shortcomings and to remedy our own defects. We must attend to our own beams before we operate on other people's motes."

There is special reference to our relation to Roman Catholicism, as well as to Eastern Orthodoxy, and quotation from a speech of Lord Halifax:

"Do not let us be afraid to speak plainly of the possibility, of the desirability of a union with Rome. Let us say boldly that we desire peace with Rome with all our hearts. Public opinion will never be influenced if we hold our tongues. It is influenced by those who have the courage of their opinions."

For two years after ordination, I was master at St. Paul's, for the most part teaching Latin and History. I liked teaching and liked boys; but as I had been ordained in the hope of doing pastoral work, I left St. Paul's in 1897 to become Rector of St. Martin's, New Bedford, Massachusetts. St. Martin's was a parish for mill-people, many of them from Lancashire, established on good Church-lines by the Reverend Alfred Evan Johnson, who had been Rector nine years. The work was inspiring, as there were plenty of boys and girls, and good helpers in the persons of a number of ladies belonging to Grace Church, New Bedford. There was little money in the parish, but plenty of souls; and with a well-filled church, over-crowded parish-house, good services, simple but reverent and hearty, with much more to do than could ever be accomplished,

life at St. Martin's was well worth living. I could not have had a parish that I should have liked better, if as well, and never have felt more in my element than during my three years as Rector of St. Martin's.

Before ordination, my secret ambition had been to teach Church History: but there were few opportunities; I was not a graduate of an American seminary and so in line for them; as Rector of St. Martin's I forgot all about it; and if I could have remained in the parish, I should never have wished to leave. However, after three years with no real vacation, I went to pieces; and friends saw before I did that I could not go on at New Bedford in the conditions under which I had to do my work. To my surprise in 1900 I was offered the Chair of Church History in Berkeley Divinity School, Middletown, Connecticut, in succession to the Reverend William Allen Johnson, and at the same time the Latin Professorship and Chaplaincy of Trinity College, Hartford. Between these two I could not hesitate; the former was more in my line: the only difficulty in the matter was in deciding to leave St. Martin's.

I went to Berkeley in 1900 and remained until 1903, occupying the rooms in Jarvis House in which Bishop Williams had lived during the first seventeen years of the School's history, with the best study I have ever had or expect to have. Three tranquil years left nothing but delightful memories. I had pleasantest relations with everybody and was especially devoted both to the Dean, Dr. John Binney, one of the most chivalrous and courteous men I have ever known, and to Dr. Samuel Hart, whom I came to know well, living under the same

roof for three years. There were few students, but they were congenial companions: and it is always a pleasure to recall the time spent in Berkeley and Middletown.

To be in Berkeley meant to be in close touch with the Seabury tradition of Connecticut. I had always appreciated this, felt that it represented the inner spirit of the American Church, and, in spite of much timidity in its conservatism, stood for the structural principles of Anglican Catholicity. I liked to illustrate these from Bishop Seabury's *Discourses*, and took great satisfaction in the thought that Bishop Seabury and Bishop Hobart had taught and illustrated all the principles of the Oxford Movement years before Keble's famous Assize Sermon. Bishop Seabury's altar was in Berkeley Chapel; his chalice and paten were in use on special occasions; I tried to get Dr. Hart to ask the Bishop to authorize the use of his Communion Service, the first American Rite, in Berkeley once a year. I also developed a filial veneration for Bishop Berkeley and was impressed by the continuous witness to Catholic principles throughout the history of the Church of England in America. My Connecticut associations were continued in New York by a close friendship with Dr. William Jones Seabury. I shared his devotion to the Seabury tradition and joined him in annual commemorations of his great-grandfather's consecration.*

In 1903, I was elected to the St.-Mark-in-the-Bowery

* I was of course interested in the Seabury documents in his possession, and once said, "If these are stolen, suspect me." Not long after a sneak-thief entered 8 Chelsea Square and, in his rummaging, opened the box containing the Seabury

Chair of Ecclesiastical History in the General Theological Seminary, New York, in succession to Dr. Thomas Richey.* I lived in New York for over five years, occupying No. 5 Chelsea Square, the house at the end of West Building, in those days vine-covered and attractive outside. It had been built for Dr. Turner, first Professor of Biblical Learning, in 1836, and always seemed to me the best house in the quadrangle. I thought the Dean ought to take it for the Deanery.

My History lectures followed lines laid out at Berkeley, though all were brought into better shape. Although further study led me to modify details, the general conception of the Church and of the special function of Anglicanism was that which I had learned in Oxford. The substance of them was subsequently compressed into *Outlines of Church History*, written for the New York Sunday School Commission and published by the Young Churchman Company in 1916. In undertaking the textbook, I did not think much about it, as it only involved arrangement of the substance of old notebooks: but when I had finished, I recognized that it represented more of my thought on all subjects than any work I had ever done. In it I tried the experiment,

papers. Dr. Seabury's daughter-in-law at once thought, "Could it have been Professor Kinsman?"; but on discovering that only a watch was missing, gave me benefit of doubt!

* My first visit to the Seminary was made in 1894. A friend pointed out Dr. Richey crossing the quadrangle. I remember thinking, "Old gentleman, some day I should like to succeed to your post." I never set foot in Chelsea Square again until I came to visit the Acting-Dean (Dr. Cady) as Professor-elect.

long before my mind, of teaching History backwards. My chief notions about the study of Church History are expressed in the Preface.

"The study of History, like that of Natural Science, cultivates habits of caution in estimating evidence, the desire for exact facts, and ultimately supreme devotion to Truth. The chief requisite for its successful pursuit is patience. Patience is the chief characteristic of the industry which seeks to discover the secrets of the elusive past, and of the contentment, which makes the most of partial demonstrations, presumptive proofs when there cannot be certainty. History, like language and Nature, 'half reveals and half conceals' the soul within. In historical as in physical science, we have to be satisfied with such measures of truth as lie within the grasp of our present faculties, recognizing that at best we can discern only outlines with many dim intervals. Its study requires patience and teaches patience. Knowledge of the many minds of many men, of the diversities of operations of one Spirit, shows that all men and all things cannot be made after one pattern, and that we must seek to understand many whose ways of thinking and acting are different from our own. The study of History ought to be a school of justice and sympathy. Church History introduces us to Christian brothers in all parts of the world and in all ages of the world's development. It has a broadening effect like that of extensive travel; it ought also to have a deepening effect in its kindly touch of the varieties and vagaries of human nature. It represents a profound study of man, and of man in relation to Almighty God. From beginning to end, it is the record of men working not by themselves, but in harmony with a greater Power, 'the Lord working with them and confirming the word with signs following.'

Ubi enim Ecclesia, ibi et Spiritus Dei:
Et ubi Spiritus Dei, illic Ecclesia et omnis gratia:
Spiritus autem veritas."

The History work was very congenial, the special interest coming from seminars and special courses in which thorough work was possible. I greatly liked my pupils and have always found my best friends among young men. "General" students were no more interesting than those at Berkeley; but there were more of them. The Churchmanship of the Seminary was congenial to me.* The Dean, Dr. Robbins, more consistent a Churchman than I was in some ways, aimed at creating an environment of what I considered right ideals; and I was in sympathy with his pastoral policies as I should have been, I think, had I stayed on under his successor, Dean Fosbroke. Of the Seminary professors, I was most intimate with Dr. Roper (Bishop of Ottawa), an old Keble man, and of the New York clergy with Dr. William T. Manning, both as Vicar of St. Agnes' and Rector of Trinity. Outside New York my closest friend was Professor Rhinelander of Cambridge (Bishop of Pennsylvania). All these strengthened my confidence in Anglican Catholicity, although, as I have

* Since 1895, I have always had in my study a color-sketch of a Catacomb fresco symbolizing the Eucharist, under which I printed in black-letter the whole of *Adoro Te devote, latens Deitas*. I have wished the hymn always in sight, not from associations with, or even knowledge of, St. Thomas Aquinas, *Corpus Christi*, or the thanksgiving after Mass, but because an English version was invariably sung on Sundays in Shepton, and because I used it constantly at the General Seminary.

always been solitary in thinking out things, I was probably not greatly influenced by anybody. For three years I had the pleasure of association with St. Faith's Training School for Deaconesses. The Warden, Dr. Huntington, asked me to deliver lectures on the History of Missions; and this gave the privilege of having some fine young women for pupils and the great benefit of the influence and friendship of the Dean, Deaconess Susan Trevor Knapp.

For three years my chief interest in New York was in the Cathedral of St. John the Divine. I was a member of the Corporation and of the Building Committee, with duties involving special association with the Reverend Dr. W. R. Huntington of Grace Church and the Reverend Dr. Grosvenor of the Incarnation, afterward Dean. My special work was to provide information as to ecclesiastical details for the decoration, the first task being to give Mr. Gutzon Borglum data as to likenesses and vestments for the statues in the St. Columba Chapel; the last, the drawing up of a scheme of subjects for the decoration of the whole Choir, which was printed but soon relegated to obscurity. I secured some stones from the Church of St. John in Ephesus, one of which was placed in front of the High Altar. The drafting of an inscription for this was the last work done by Dr. Huntington for the Cathedral. He dictated a letter to me about it the day before his death. The last church service which I attended in New York before going to Delaware was the funeral of Bishop Henry Potter, at whose burial in the crypt of the Cathedral I was present as one of the honorary pall-bearers.

Of subsequent visits to New York, some of the pleasantest were those made to the new St. Faith's by the Cathedral, when by kind arrangement of Dean Grosvenor I was allowed to have the daily celebrations of the Eucharist in the St. Ambrose Chapel. This enumeration of details cannot fail to show that ministerial work gave me varied and most delightful experiences.

In 1905, I spent the summer abroad, going to Oxford in June to be present at Keble on the occasion of the Archbishop of Canterbury's first coming as Visitor, and had the honor of meeting the Archbishop (Dr. Davidson) for the first time and also the Bishop of Winchester (Dr. Talbot), both of them having recently returned from a visit to America. Later in the summer I went for a month's reading at St. Deiniol's Library, Hawarden, and for short visits to Canterbury and Shepton.

The main purpose of the trip, however, was to visit Constantinople and Asia Minor. I wished to freshen up my lectures on the conciliar period and, as I was planning a special course on the Church in Ephesus for the following year, to gain some first-hand knowledge of Ephesian archæology. I was fortunate beyond expectation. The excavation of the Cathedral Church of St. Mary, in which the third General Council sat, had just been completed by Austrians; and the Artemision, usually covered by a frog-pond, had been pumped out by British archæologists for the first time since its discovery in 1873. I was able therefore to see the Cathedral as it had been freshly uncovered, and, although the full report of the Austrian excavations has not yet been

published, I was able through Professor Weber, the chief authority on Ephesian archæology, later to secure photographs and plans for use in seminar, which gave material not otherwise accessible. I spent the early days of July in exploring the hills and ruins of Ephesus.*

I saw rather carefully the ecclesiastical antiquities of Constantinople and Smyrna, had brief glimpses of Athens and Corinth, spent ten days in Rome, left Italy by the Adriatic towns, Ancona, Rimini, and Ravenna, joined a Seminary colleague in Vienna and Innsbruck, and a Keble friend in Constance, Cologne, Aachen, and Bruges. It was all interesting; but the fascination of a first visit to the east Mediterranean countries so far exceeded anything else that I cut out a projected excursion into the Dolomites by way of punishment for not being more enthusiastic over Rome and Ravenna.

No trip ever interested me as much as this except one taken with my sister during the winter of 1913-14. This included visits to the cities of the Rhone Valley, to Sicily, and to Naples; but the most of our time was

* The Austrian excavators in the Church of St. Mary had uncovered a number of tombs, scattering the bones. I collected them and reinterred them in the middle of the older basilica with Anglican rites! As I read the Burial Office, the great Amphitheatre, in which the Ephesians cried to Diana in their rage against St. Paul, was in sight across the plain, and as I looked at this with the bones of ancient Ephesian Christians about me, it gave point to "If after the manner of men I have fought with beasts at Ephesus, what advantageth me, if the dead rise not?" I have never since read the lesson in the Burial Office without a vision of St. Mary's, Ephesus, and the surrounding hills as they appeared on July 4, 1905.

spent in north Africa. From Epiphany until Ash Wednesday we were in Tunis, whence I could go any day to the site and ruins of Carthage, which I came to know well. I spent many hours in the amphitheatre which saw the martyrdom of St. Perpetua and her companions, and amid the ruins of the Cathedral in which sat the many Councils of Carthage; and many times of quiet before the Tabernacle in the Lady-Chapel of the Primatiale of Carthage, dedicated to St. Cyprian and St. Louis, both of whom died near the spot. During the winter I made side excursions to Kairouan, Sousse, the borders of the desert at Tozeur, and into St. Augustine's country, stopping some time at Souk Ahras (Thagaste) and at Hippone.*

These references to interest in Christian archæology naturally follow an account of seminary work. They also serve to place me, in one small respect, in the category with Dr. Brightman. An enthusiastic visitor at the Pusey House once exclaimed, "You ought to see our city, only ten years old, and with fifty thousand inhabitants." Brightman quietly remarked, "I had rather see a place that was fifty thousand years old and had only ten inhabitants!"

* My one opportunity to have an actual share in archæological exploration I had to miss. In 1904 I was invited by Sir William Ramsay to join a party going for a summer's work at Konieh (Iconium). Inability to accept the invitation brought bitter disappointment.

CHAPTER V

DELAWARE

On St. Simon and St. Jude's Day, 1908, I was consecrated Bishop of Delaware. I knew less of Delaware than of any of the eastern States, had never set foot on its soil, and did not know half a dozen Delawareans. I had met Bishop Coleman several times, but did not know him well. Although very willing to go to the new work, I had some misgivings about doing so, as I found the churchpeople had quite mistaken notions of me. I was reassured by Judge Boyce, who said, "You're not a bit like what we thought; but we think you'll do." From the beginning, I greatly liked the warm-hearted Delaware people, a liking that steadily increased as I lived among them for eleven years. My work carried me constantly to all parts of the State, giving a wide acquaintance with people and local affairs, and a place in the State life which had little or nothing to do with my office in the Episcopal Church. The title "of Delaware" had much to do with this, the State name giving favorable introduction to many who had no use for Bishops. More than once I was approached by down-State people who were not Episcopalians with the greeting, "This must be our Bishop." In the Episcopal Church, I was in contact with many of the leading men in the State, and through my office had friends in almost every community: but I had quite as many friends out-

side the Church, some of them among the most intimate. I cared for none of my own clergy more than for the Presbyterian minister in Middletown; and when I wished an especially good gossip about Delaware people, past and present, I sought by preference a Methodist Judge in Georgetown and a Presbyterian lady in Milford. Yet I had never any illusion that I might be classed with Delawareans by birth. As a Smyrna man once said to me, "You might be born only half a mile over the Maryland border, and be brought into Delaware at the age of fifteen minutes, and stay here all your life: but every one here would know that you were not a true Blue Hen's Chicken." Nevertheless it was very satisfactory to be a Delawarean by position and adoption.

The history of Delaware, first of the States, and its State-life are deeply interesting. There is an intense State-consciousness which in the nature of things cannot exist elsewhere. Only in Delaware does a compact community of two hundred thousand people constitute a sovereign commonwealth; and only on a peninsula, settled for three hundred years with no recent influx of new families, can every one know of everybody else, and be so conscious of State and County bonds. Wilmington, in close contact with Philadelphia and Baltimore, with many people coming from other places, resembles many cities of its size with brisk business and pleasant homes: but the rest of the State has only the local flavor. The little peninsular State is unique. Until recently it suffered in some ways from its isolation, but is now quickly losing provincial limitations.

There have been important changes during the past ten years, and changes for the better. Better roads and automobiles have done much to break up rural seclusion, bringing habits of travel to those who a few years ago seldom went far from their own farms: the standards of education have been raised through the influence of Delaware College and the wise activities and gifts of those who are improving the public schools: the demands for war-work induced fine co-operation between all communities in the State, enabling Delaware to establish an enviable record, in several ways giving it first place among States of the Union. I noticed illustrations of the freer and more frequent intermingling of people from all parts of the State in the congregations assembled in certain old churches which were opened only once or twice a year. In 1909 and 1910, the congregations in Old Christ Church, Broad Creek, and Prince George's, Dagsboro, were composed of the families who drove up in buggies from farms lying within a ten-mile circle; after 1914, most of them came in automobiles, chiefly Fords, many from towns, of Maryland as well as of Delaware, forty and fifty miles away. Time will doubtless change many things: but it cannot deprive Delaware of its special character and interest, as long as the three small Counties, sending but a single Congressman to Washington, yet have their two Senators, and their Governor heading the procession of Governors at the inauguration of the President.

A perfectly conscientious Bishop of Delaware would have a heart composed of three absolutely equal lobes, labelled respectively New Castle, Kent, and Sussex.

Not being perfectly conscientious, I always felt, and shamelessly avowed, a special affection for Sussex County. This was because I recognized there all that was most characteristically Delawarean and liked it. The head of Delaware may be in Wilmington, and in Dover its lungs; but its heart—and stomach—are in good old Sussex. There is much of Sussex County in Wilmington.* Of the Sussex County towns, I was always forced to own a special partiality for Lewes. The charm of a "sea-change," and the interesting experiences of its pilots, gave a zest to life not to be found out of sight of Cape Henlopen. I had many pleasant Sussex homes, in Georgetown, Seaford, Laurel, Millsboro, Delmar, and many outlying farms; but of all of them the one I most cared for was the Lewes Rectory under the shadow of St. Peter's. As a Bishop, I ought not to have had, or at least ought not to have avowed, special local attachments; but I think they have served to make me something more of a Delawarean.

Bishopstead in Wilmington is a charming old house, built in 1742, and since 1842 the home of the Bishops of Delaware. Its special feature is the beautiful private Chapel of the Good Shepherd. I could not have had an official residence more to my liking, and never ceased to be grateful to Mr. Francis Gurney du Pont,

* The ideal Delawarean is born in Sussex County, where he is related to everybody on his own side of the County, and knows everybody on the other. He marries a Kent County wife, and later lives, and practices law, in Wilmington, eventually becoming Governor of Delaware or Judge of the Supreme Court.

who had given the house and chapel to the Diocese. The grounds sloping toward the Brandywine are attractive, affording space for gatherings of people more than the house would hold; and the place was quickly filled for me with many reminders of the kindness of the churchpeople of Wilmington. Living at Wilmington made it easy to make frequent visits to the mother-town of New Castle and to the Colleges in Newark. Of all my associations I cared for none more than that with Delaware College. The two Presidents whom I knew, Dr. Harter and Dr. Mitchell, I greatly liked and admired: I knew many of the College boys and girls in their homes, and kept track of them after they came to College: I was frequently at the fraternity houses, feeling especially at home in the Kappa Alpha. After the founding of the Women's College, Dean Robinson made me welcome as a frequent visitor: and of all I have lost in leaving Delaware, I regret nothing more than the breaking of contact with the Colleges at Newark and the Delaware students.

I always liked my work as *chorepiscopus*. Bishop Lawrence once said in an address to the Massachusetts Convention, "Remember that the weakest mission needs the Bishop more than the strongest parish." I took this as a motto for diocesan work and deserved something of a frequent criticism that I was always in the country, seldom in the city. It seemed to me that in the country I was more needed; at any rate, I was given more opportunities for work. It was my ambition to know every road in Delaware; and I did know most of them. I liked keeping appointments at places remote

from the railroad, like St. George's, Indian River, and St. Mark's, Little Creek. Among my most helpful assistants were the men and boys who drove me about the country, and a "band" of five boys from Lewes under direction of Dr. Robinson, who provided music for special services in isolated churches. There were many delightful surprises and tests of resourcefulness in the demands of the country work. Custom could never stale its infinite variety.

It was always easy for me in visiting different churches to adapt myself to the customs of the place. As seminary professor for eight years, I had been identified with no one parish, and, as special preacher, had been in touch with many churches in the dioceses of Connecticut, New York, Long Island, Newark, and New Jersey. I was familiar with different sorts of congregations and services, and was in the habit of fitting in everywhere. This was a distinct advantage in assuming charge of a diocese. I had no feeling of strangeness in the different churches even at the outset. I liked a Bishop's pastoral work, loved Confirmations and Institutions of Rectors, liked preaching if there was any sign of sympathetic atmosphere, and especially occasional share in parochial work. One of the chief privileges of the small diocese was that there could be much of this. If the clergy wished, I could get to each church of the diocese at least three times a year, twice on Sundays: the Bishop was the only general missionary, and in parochial vacancies often the one who could most easily assume temporary charge. I usually had several vacant parishes and missions to care for,

so that there was never danger of becoming a mere "confirming-machine." There were certain churches in which I was most happily at home, especially Old Swedes', Wilmington; St. Peter's, Lewes; and Christ Church, Dover.

Under Archdeacon Thompson, the Dover Church, dating from 1730, had been "restored" as a beautiful example of colonial architecture; the churchyard, through gifts of Mrs. Eugene du Pont, had been put in perfect order; the services were beautiful and reverent, and, best of all, valued and used by a devout congregation. Dover was the most convenient point from which to travel about the diocese: Dover Rectory was one of my most delightful homes: hence I was always thankful when by visits to Dover I could combine official duty with personal pleasure. If I had died Bishop of Delaware, I had wished to be buried in the Dover churchyard.

Of all the ministerial work I have ever had to do, I have cared most for Quiet Days, of which I have conducted many, and for Retreats, of which I never conducted but four. Two of these last stand out in my memory as the brightest spots in a ministry of twenty-four years. The first was for the undergraduates of the General Seminary before Lent in 1906, the second for priests at Holy Cross Monastery in the September Embertide of 1916.* In Delaware I could do some

* Of all places I know in the country, the one which has drawn me most is the monastery of the Holy Cross Fathers. As a home of devotion and good works, bringing association with the strongest of consecrated lives, I have known nothing like it: and when once the Father Superior offered me

work of this sort and always valued the opportunities. There were annual Quiet Days for the Woman's Auxiliary, occasional Quiet Days for Clergy, and sometimes little parochial missions. I look back with special gratitude to missions in St. Luke's, Seaford, and St. Anne's, Middletown, where the congregations shared my liking for evangelistic hymns.

Among the chief privileges of a Bishop are his glimpses into many homes. I had many of these, and was allowed not only to see homes but to appropriate them. Even in Wilmington I formed habits of a cuckoo in taking possession of other people's nests, especially in one house just across the Brandywine from Bishopstead. Of all the homes I have ever seen or known, I found the best in Delaware rectories. I always maintained that, if General Convention would provide for a display of Church produce, I could at any time win prizes for the Diocese of Delaware by an exhibit of wives of the clergy! I could have made a good show too with children. Not only were the families of most of the Delaware clergy good in themselves and in their domestic relations; but, in giving examples of well-ordered households, they were helps in parochial work. Clergy were usefully assisted by the social tactfulness of their wives; and their preaching was the more effective if they possessed good-tempered, obedient children. It was not mere personal and diocesan pride which made me feel that the inhabitants of Delaware rectories whom I knew, might be ranged with the best.

a cell of my own, I should have liked nothing better than to be able to accept it.

In my diocesan as in earlier work, my experience was varied, congenial, and brought pleasantest associations. In looking back, it seems to me that the Episcopal Church gave me everything I could most wish. I had a special ambition to teach Church History, and two opportunities were given me: of all the parishes I have ever known, the one I should pick for myself would be St. Martin's, New Bedford: in recent years the only post I could possibly wish was that of Bishop of Delaware. Delaware people, like all others, have their limitations, diocesan work in Delaware, like all others, its drawbacks: but these never disturbed me. I had plenty of difficulties and disappointments, but knew of no other Bishop who had so few. I liked being a Bishop chiefly for the association with the House of Bishops; but the only diocese I could conceive of wishing was Delaware. The surroundings and conditions of my work satisfied me; so far as they were concerned, I ought to have been, and was, quite happy. That was all on the surface. Below the surface, during almost my whole episcopate I was increasingly troubled, passing through successive stages of disappointment, disillusion, doubt, and disbelief, owing to the waning of faith in the church system which I was set in Delaware to represent: but the reasons for this had nothing whatever to do with my special field of work, and hence even this brief allusion to them is out of place in this chapter.

CHAPTER VI

ANGLICANISM

The day of my consecration as Bishop sealed my doom as an Anglican. While it was possible to maintain a purely theoretical view of the Anglican position, it was possible for me to believe in the essential catholicity of its inner spirit, of its tendencies, and of its ultimate achievements. As Seminary professor or rector of a "Catholic parish," I should probably never have had misgivings, much less doubts. Most Anglicans assume that the special atmosphere about them represents the breath of the Church's truest life; and this is especially true of Catholic-minded Anglicans. They are themselves Catholics, and their special task is "to Catholicize the Church." This feeling I shared until as Bishop I felt the necessity of a Church to Catholicize me! The theories did not stand the test of a bishop's varied experience of the system's actual workings, his necessary contact with and share in all phases of the Church's life. Eleven years in the episcopate convinced me against my will and in spite of knowledge that other like-minded Bishops did not agree with me, that the work with which I was identified was merely the propagation of a form of Protestantism; that belief in it as Liberal Catholicism was but an amiable delusion. Abandonment of work did not signify in my case repudiation of Protestant principles, for these I had

never held; but the loss of belief in the Catholic interpretation of the Anglican position. It was quite just that the defection should be most resented by members of the Anglo-Catholic party.

I never have been, and never could be, Protestant in the ordinary sense of the term; yet this does not mean that I cannot appreciate the high aims of Protestants and their good works. While I no longer believe, as I once did, that "on the whole the Protestant Reformation of the sixteenth century was beneficial," and that "taken as a whole, Protestantism has been the strongest religious influence active during the past three hundred years," from the statements of sympathy with Protestantism's positive aims which I have made in the past I retract nothing.* To my criticisms of, and

* Cf. Kinsman: *Principles of Anglicanism,* pp. 127-135; Kinsman: *Catholic and Protestant,* pp. 82-85; *Issues before the Church,* pp. 27-29. My attitude in the present as in the past would be indicated by the following statement made in 1915.

"All my life I have had to do with Presbyterians. I have never known any but good ones; and my Presbyterian friends include the best people I have known anywhere. From personal knowledge I know that the Spirit of God is working in the Presbyterian Communion; and I have the highest respect for what Presbyterians have contributed, and are likely to contribute, to the development of the country. In some communities I know, I consider that they represent the strongest element for good, a stronger element than Episcopalians. There are no people with whom I should more wish to be in sympathetic co-operation, none with whom I should feel less justified in making arrogant assumption of superiority. Every personal feeling makes me wish to work with Presbyterians. I acknowledge that their religious system is good, because I know its fruits and its character.

reasons for disbelief in, Protestantism, made in past years, I should now add nothing. If, at the present time, it were necessary to give these, I should merely quote statements which I have made in print during the past seven years.*

"Yet that does not lead me to think it the best, nor to make me feel that sympathy and charity compel me to sacrifice my own convictions to the supposed wishes of Presbyterian friends any more than I expect them to sacrifice their convictions to mine. (I have never found that straightforward avowal of convictions prevented friendly intercourse with those who had different, but equally strong, convictions of their own. Quite the contrary.) The older I grow, the less I can believe that Calvinistic theology adequately presents the teaching of the New Testament, or that systems based upon it are best fitted to preserve the finest qualities of Christian life. The more I know of Calvinistic influence, the more I am convinced that, as compared with original Christianity, it represents a down-grade. It has shown an inevitable trend toward Unitarianism, which I understand and respect, though unable to accept its negations, and can only regard as 'a feather-bed to catch a falling Christian.' Hence, the more I value many positive products of Presbyterian influence, the more for the sake of their preservation would I wish to see them on what I believe a more secure basis. When I have to choose between the fundamental principles and assumptions of the ancient Catholic Church and those of my Presbyterian friends—or rather the system from which they are named—I choose the ancient principles, not that theories of ministry and sacraments are things of chief importance, but because they apply and protect the central doctrines of faith which we all alike profess." *Issues before the Church,* pp. 27 f.

* The fullest statement would be found in *Principles of Anglicanism,* pp. 135-164, in a paper on *The Achievements and Failures of Protestantism.* Cf. *Catholic and Protestant,* pp. 51-56. The gist of these passages would be given in such sentences as the following:

Like many others I interpreted "Protestant Episcopal" as equivalent to "Non-Roman Catholic." When I felt forced to admit that "Protestant" applied to Episcopalians meant essentially the same as when applied to other religious bodies, I gave up. I think now that Episcopalians who know themselves to be Protestants, are the ones who rightly interpret their position. It might seem strange that any Episcopalians should consider themselves Catholics; but this is a possible alternative for those who face an inevitable dilemma. "Protestant Episcopal" represents a contradiction in terms. Protestantism overthrew priesthood and especially the chief-priesthood, the episcopate; no real Protestant believes in priests or bishops. Episcopacy, that is the hierarchical system of the ancient Catholic Church, asserts principles which Protestantism denies.

"It is not long since it was a common thing to hear people glorify the period of the Reformation as a golden age in the history of religion and political freedom. No one familiar with the history can do that. It was a troubled time with many ugly features, a time of conflict only to be defended as inevitable in an age of transition, a time of tearing down for the sake of building up. The wars it occasioned are only the most striking examples of disasters which caused the overthrow of freedom, education, and righteousness, all of them ideals for which the Reformation is popularly supposed to stand." *Outlines of Church History,* p. 102.

"Any one who takes broad views of human life and history can not fail to see, in reviewing the whole course of Protestant development, that, with positive strength which the world could not afford to lose, there have been elements of weakness, suppressions and distortions of truth, of which the world can not too soon get rid." *Catholic and Protestant,* p. 56.

"The basis of Protestantism was, even in the beginning, a

Hence a real believer in Episcopacy is not, and never can be, a thoroughgoing Protestant. Protestant Episcopalians must choose between their adjective and their noun; and whichever choice they make involves mental reservations as to the other half of their official title. I was one of those who stuck to the noun and let the adjective shift for itself. I now think that, however much the noun expresses Anglican theory, it is the adjective which describes the working facts.

My beliefs about Anglicanism, the gist of my teaching about it in Seminary days, have been in various forms put in print. These assumed the substantial excellence of the guiding principles of the English Reformation. (I have never been in sympathy with those who believe that modern Episcopalianism is destined to perpetuate the unreformed Church of England; at least, though in sympathy with their aspirations, not with their applications of principle to existing institutions and history.) I believed enthusiastically in "the Anglican type of Christianity, a combination of conservatism and liberalism, determined to stand 'on the ancient ways,' yet ever ready to enter new paths of usefulness." *

protest not only against ecclesiastical abuses, but also a protest against authority as such and a protest against the supernatural. The gradual developments of Protestant history have made this increasingly evident. God is a supernatural authority; and in the end God has to go. Hence it is that one of the bishops could say recently, 'The goal of Protestantism is atheism.' Not that Protestants set out for this goal, or that many have reached it; but that being rooted and centred in self, Protestantism inaugurates a tendency which ultimately excludes God." *Issues before the Church.*

* *Outlines of Church History,* p. 69.

The substance of my Seminary lectures was summarized in a course of Reinecker Lectures delivered at the Virginia Theological Seminary in Alexandria in 1909 and published as *Principles of Anglicanism* in 1910. The following are characteristic statements.

"It is possible so to define the Anglican position of *via media* as to make it seem a timid avoidance of error, standing for nothing definite and positive, a shrinking from possible danger on the right and on the left, which leaves little solid ground to stand on. It is better understood as deliberate occupancy of a central position, in itself safe and stable, and offering peculiar advantages of reconciling and combining the positive principles of those who flank its position on both sides. The characteristic answer of Anglican compromise when confronted by a question of dilemma, 'Which will you choose, this side or that side?' is 'Both!' . . . The clue to the meaning of Anglicanism is to be found in the theory not that it avoids twofold error, but that it seeks combination of twofold truth." *

"If English Church history has one special lesson, and if there be one lesson which the Anglican Church has had best opportunities to learn, and ought to be in a position to teach, it is the duty of *balance by combination.* The characteristic Anglican virtue is, or ought to be, *balance;* its contribution to religious development ought to be the safeguarding of the whole of truth by the combination of opposing or partial truths, whose harmony is not at first apparent." †

"It is perfectly conceivable that Anglicanism should cease

* *Anglicanism,* p. 11.
† *Ibid.,* p. 88.

to exist. From present indications it appears that a number of the religious systems and ecclesiastical institutions, which originated in the sixteenth century, are passing out of existence. . . . More and more does it seem likely that the alignment in future is to place in one camp the maintainers of the historic faith of the New Testament over against various forms of Unitarianism, which are likely more and more explicitly to abandon the New Testament, recognizing that the miraculous element is everywhere interwoven in its tissue. If this be true, the future of Christianity will lie with that Communion which can best vindicate its claim to represent the religion of the New Testament, that is, Christianity according to the apostolic norm. Anglicanism is one of the forms of Christianity which claim to perpetuate this. If its claim be not valid, it had best make way for a Christianity which can better vindicate the claim, and the sooner the better. But so long as it does exist, and so long as it can give any reasonable justification of its existence, it must bear consistent witness to the Scriptural principles of the Incarnation and the Church. Its characteristic contribution to Christian development, however that contribution be combined with others, must be the instinct of giving the ancient spirit a truly modern expression. This is the ideal which challenges us to a stricter and sterner effort than we have hitherto shown to give it approximate realization." *

It was with this optimistic view of the principles of the Communion in which I had been consecrated a "Bishop of the Church of God" that I went to Delaware in 1908; but I soon discovered that there were great discrepancies between theories and facts. I re-

* *Anglicanism*, p. 85.

member saying after the publication of *Principles of Anglicanism*, "Very few of our people know what these are; and few of those who do believe them!" Yet I believed them myself, and never thought of being discouraged while I could do so. My notion of a Bishop was that one of his chief duties was to keep cheerful, to be on the lookout for good work, to approve and encourage those who were doing it, never to find fault when it could be avoided, and always to lay stress on the bright side of things. In my previous work I had for the most part been a cheerful sort of person, and for a time I was able to keep this up in Delaware. I liked my surroundings, made the most of any signs of progress, did not mind difficulties so long as there seemed to be movement in a right direction, and was thankful to have my place and post so long as I was confident of the essential goodness of the special work I was set to do. But the optimism was oozing rapidly by the end of my third year.

This was not due to any specially trying experiences or difficult personal relations. My tasks were comparatively easy; on the whole, according to accepted standards, my efforts were successful; looking about the Church, there was no other Bishop with whom I should have been willing to change places. So far as I was personally concerned, things went well enough; but I came less and less to be satisfied with the actual accomplishments of the Church in teaching and training.

I do not think that this was due to narrowly partisan views. I had for long laid stress on a saying of Frederick Denison Maurice to the effect, "Trust a man in

what he affirms; distrust him in what he denies." I wished to think that, taken on the positive side, every one was in the right, that the thing to do was to find each man's positive side, and ignore the others. As Bishop, I wished to understand and back up every one in his special positive truth and special form of positive usefulness. I applied this principle to parties in the Church and different religious bodies. I thought, and still think, that all have hold of special and partial truths, and that the way to understand and deal with each is to recognize the truth at the basis of their thought and practice. I remembered a bit of advice of Bishop Creighton's to the effect that the best way to meet and dispose of an objection is to sympathize with it. Sympathy is the most effective form of antagonism. It was a special hobby of mine that the three schools of thought in the Church simply divided the Creed between them, and that each needed the others to supplement and develop its own special position.

"The Fatherhood of God, the foundation of all theology, proclaiming One Father with the aim of realizing one brotherhood of all mankind, is the basis of all Broad Church preaching. The heart of the Creed, belief in the Divine Son, Redeemer of all individual souls, is the basis of the Evangelical appeal for conversion and missionary venture. The High Church emphasis on Church and Sacraments is nothing but practical belief in the Holy Ghost, God in present action, drawing men to Our Lord, and through Him to the Father. No matter at which point we first touch the Creed, when it is learned entire, the full belief in God must come and be applied. One-sided emphasis is often

necessary owing to human tendencies to be content with half-truths; but it is unnecessary to rest content with these. Recent Anglican history teaches the necessity of correlating separated truths, of keeping 'the proportion of faith,' of cultivating an all-round Churchmanship which has all the dimensions at once. The history of Church parties is that of disproportion; the history of the Church as a whole teaches symmetry—and the justice of patience." *

I was a High Churchman, but I wanted to be more than that, being convinced that "a really good Churchman will be High, Low, and Broad all at once." I had no sympathy with the negations of Evangelicals; but I did believe that their special emphasis was on things of highest importance. My attitude toward them was indicated in a Convention sermon in 1916.

"Sometimes a distinction is made between Evangelicalism, that is loyalty to the Gospel, and Churchmanship. If so, there is no question that the former is the more important. But distinction does not necessarily imply contrariety; and there is no real contrariety here. The two things go together; and either, rightly apprehended, implies what is meant by the other. There can be no true Churchmanship which has not an evangelical basis; and there can be no consistent Evangelicalism which does not carry itself to a churchly conclusion. There is a thing calling itself churchmanship which has no evangelical root; and its fruits are 'apples of Sodom.' There is a so-called evangelicalism which rejects all sacramental and ecclesiastical ordinances; but it only issues in barren emotionalism. The history of Christianity shows that the two things need each other for balance and supplementary support.

* *Outlines of Church History*, p. 25.

"They relate fundamentally to the Person and to the Society. The Society is nothing apart from the Person; the Person is approached through the Society. The Person is the religion. There can be no pretence of religion in His Name, unless the truth about His Person be approximately realized and the hold upon His Person be vital. Nor on the other hand can personal devotion be satisfied, unless it use the means of personal communion provided in that Body which He inaugurated and inspires. There can be nothing really deep in religious conviction which does not work itself out in lofty apprehension of the Divine love which works in the Church through the Holy Spirit. . . .

"We often disparage the terms 'evangelical' and 'ecclesiastical' because both have been misused to denote opposite forms of Christian one-sidedness. Better far to rehabilitate both the names and the things they represent, and see that the true ecclesiastic is evangelical to the core, and that the consistent Evangelical, if he only knows it, is potentially an ecclesiastic through and through."

As Bishop, above all things, I wanted to be *fair*, not only strictly just, but sympathetic. It seems to me that a Bishop ought, through sympathetic contact with all phases of thought and life in the people of his diocese, to be able to interpret them to themselves and to others; but even more than this, that he ought to represent the all-roundness of the faith and life of the Church at large, and bring to all limited and local conceptions something broader and more complete. This he can do, if he is alive and alert to use the opportunities of his general experience. He has chances to be in touch with the Church as a whole; and he ought to bring something of this into all parts of his diocese. He must represent

what is before and about him in his own special field of work, but even more what is behind him in the spirit and life of the Church.

In dealing with Churchmen of different antecedents from my own, I not only wished to be just in understanding them, but also, as Bishop, to protect them in their rights. I had to deal with some whose teaching on certain points was, according to my standards, deficient: but they had come by their beliefs precisely as I had come by mine, through education in the Episcopal Church, which had made them feel, as it had me, that the genius of the Church was best expressed by the special form with which they were familiar. I had come quite naturally by one version of things in Oxford; many of my clergy had come by a quite different one in Alexandria. The Church sanctioned both views—this I had to admit; as Bishop, I was bound to recognize and protect both views impartially. My own position was approximately Old Catholic: I knew clergy who were approximately Reformed Episcopalian. I had no sympathy with the notion that we were "all dishonest together." We were all quite honest together, together brought up in the Episcopal Church, and quite honest in holding as her special doctrine what teachers in that Church had taught us. What the Church at large tolerated, as Bishop I was bound to tolerate. I had taken a solemn oath to maintain "the Doctrine, Discipline, and Worship of the Protestant Episcopal Church"; and for these and these only could I stand in Delaware. In interpreting them I had to be guided by general custom, not by personal preference. While I had the

same right as others, and exercised it constantly, to propound and defend views on which the Church had taken no definite stand, I could not officially insist on them. I never had any notion of being a Bishop-at-large, or that in any matter I could take official action beyond the limits imposed by the Communion from which I had received my commission.

I think that, as my diocese came to know me, it was generally recognized that I wished to be fair, and that most thought that I was fair. My relations with clergy were almost uniformly pleasant. Only in two instances did I ever meet with discourtesy from any of them; and in cases where they felt they had grievances against me, the grievance evaporated, or I was eventually credited with good intentions if not good judgment. Differences in Churchmanship never affected personal relations. I had no closer personal friends, or more effective helpers, than the Rectors of Immanuel, Wilmington, both Presidents of the Standing Committee, the Reverend Kensey Johns Hammond and the Reverend William H. Laird, D.D., both pronounced Low Churchmen. I was much drawn to Alexandria men because they could understand Delaware people. If I had had the filling of Delaware parishes, I should usually have wished men who had their spirit from Alexandria and their churchmanship from somewhere else!

In thinking of problems created by the Church's policy of tolerance, the most difficult are those caused by denials of fundamental articles of the Creeds. No case of the sort occurred in Delaware; but had there been one, I should have felt bound to allow what was

notoriously allowed elsewhere. I should not have felt that Delaware could have had a standard different from that of Maryland or Pennsylvania, since a standard is determined by customary interpretation of the law of the Church. I approached the matter from the standpoint of equity for my clergy rather than that of strict legality; and my reflections on this point all led to recognition of the principle, *Consuetudo est optima legis interpres.*

In thinking of the doctrinal standards of the Anglican Communion, there were several incidents which seemed to me typical illustrations of existing conditions. Chief of these were the case of Dr. Sanday in Oxford, the consecration of Dr. Hensley Henson for Hereford, and the Suter case in Massachusetts. I find many comments on these in my letters of the past four years.

"Recently it has come to the Creeds. All official statements stand firmly by them; but on many sides are claims being made that, though we still tolerate belief in the Christian facts, we do not try to impose them. Clergy and laity alike, it is urged, should be allowed to keep regular standing in the Church without being required to hold the Church's faith in the Church's sense. The Bishops of Oxford and Ely may declare the necessity of loyalty; but the Lady Margaret Professors of Divinity in Oxford and Cambridge oppose them on the plea that the Church must specially cherish 'scholarship' which has lost belief in miracle. The young writers of *Foundations* go on sapping; and the Bishops meanwhile are impotent. Anglicans are still to be permitted to believe in the Virgin Birth and the

Resurrection; but they must tolerate explanations that explain away." *

"The Massachusetts case is staggering. There could not be a more obvious demand for episcopal censure. A clergyman in an influential position, in a manual intended for diocesan Sunday Schools, denies the Virgin Birth; and the matter is formally brought to the Bishop's attention. If we have any concern for the Faith at all, here was a case calling for action. I do not credit the report that Bishop Lawrence snubbed those who objected to such teaching. He is too invariably kind and courteous for that. I think it probable that the motive underlying his inaction is a wish to maintain kindly relations. It is bad manners to introduce disagreeable topics; therefore let us avoid doctrinal discussions! This shows an indifference to the truth and imperious claims of Divine revelation, which I could not defend: but I think it fair to recognize the amiability of a desire to keep the peace. (Yet there is often more tenderness for those who deny, than for those who uphold, the Faith in our semi-Arian pacificism!) I wholly disapprove the Bishop's action as giving tacit sanction to denial of the Virgin Birth; but my trouble is not over the unwisdom, or even possible disloyalty, of the Bishop of Massachusetts, but over the significance of the incident as illustration of what is true in the Church at large. I am afraid that in ignoring the letter of the law, the Bishop only too consistently represents a spirit in the Church to which we must all succumb. I can quite see a plausible defence for such inaction. Denials of the Virgin Birth have become notoriously common in the Church of England and among ourselves. Only in exceptional cases has there been formal condemnation, and this secured with difficulty. The general

* *Issues*, p. 22.

policy and custom in the Church is to ignore such things. Under the circumstances he might well feel that he could not try to set up in Massachusetts a stricter standard than exists elsewhere. Our discipline has generally broken down and cannot be tinkered into shape by diocesan experiments. There must be some fresh start made by the Church as a whole. Had such a case arisen in Delaware, my action would have been very different from Bishop Lawrence's; but I can see that I should have felt hampered by existing conditions, and out of regard for what was fair for Delaware clergy should have contented myself with some public statement about the Virgin Birth, finding it practically impossible to arrange for proper trial of such a case. However emphatic I might have been in my personal teaching, I might have found that officially I was forced to follow the example of the Bishop of Massachusetts. The mistakes of an individual Bishop are only challenges to others to show more determined loyalty; the sting of this thing is not that the Bishop of Massachusetts is wrong, but that, as representative of the Protestant Episcopal Church, he may be right."

"Henson is a capital instance of the irrepressible issue. As a mere sin he would be quite tolerable; as a consistent illustration, he is quite unsettling. The trouble is not that his consecration was wrong, but that it was probably right. An unwise or even unfaithful Archbishop, or batch of Bishops, would be merely a challenge to the rest of us to be wise and loyal. The sting in this matter is that you or I in the Archbishop's place would have felt bound to do as he has done, and that in our respective dioceses we are all the time forced to do things of the same kind. Henson has denied the authority of episcopate and priesthood, the sacramental principle generally; and he defends, if he does

not make, denials of certain articles in the Creed. His flimsy assertion of loyalty does not alter the essential facts. Only explicit retractions and expressions of penitence could put him out of the category of repudiators of the historic ministry, sacraments, and creeds. But the Archbishop, as conscientious administrator of the system of the Establishment, has to consecrate him, since that system comprises all 'schools of thought,' is especially tender toward all sceptics, and only severe toward those who take its profession of loyalty to the ancient Church seriously. The Archbishop is consistent with himself and post-Reformation tradition in acting as he has done. Henson succeeds Percival and Hampden as merely one more example of the Church of England's determination to preserve the type. There is no getting away from Henry VIII and Cranmer, lay-domination and cringing concession to disbelief in the supernatural. It is all nonsense to set up King Charles and Laud as typical Anglicans. The only characteristically Anglican thing about them was their fate! Canterbury only brings to light what is equally true in your diocese and mine. . . . You believe sincerely in the articles of the Creed as expressing the truth of Scripture, and wish to banish denials of them from your diocese. You are at liberty to hold them in the privacy of your own mind and may talk of them, if you do so academically; but your clergy and laity may deny them freely, and though your personal opinions are known to be opposed, you are practically impotent to stop them. You have to recognize men of Henson's stamp as in perfectly good standing, and would scarcely refuse to ordain a young man who had expressed Henson's views, if any vague profession gave you a loop-hole for doing so."

"The Church plainly tolerates and encourages different conceptions of her character and practical duties. One of

these is that the Divinely appointed way of perpetuating Christianity was the establishment of a hierarchical society which, like every other society, adopted a system of discipline for the safeguarding of faith and practice; and that our own Church, truly representing the original Church, maintains similar discipline for the protection of the Church's life. Those who hold this view interpret the Anglican position in terms of the history of the ancient Church, one consequence of which is belief in barriers for safeguarding the Faith and Sacraments. 'Open Communion' and indifference to dogma are as impossible for them as for Christians of the early days. They are not mere legalists, but believe that there is no liberty save through obedience to law, especially law protective of doctrine. This view has always had its representatives in the Anglican Communion, including the most learned and holy divines in the Church of England and some of the most able men of the Church in America.

"But this view is only one among others, one of which directly opposes it. It is distinctly exclusive, whereas Anglicanism, in this country as well as in England, is notoriously inclusive of all who approach it from the Protestant side. In our own Church, we have aimed at making room for all possessing amiable intentions who are willing to make any use whatever of the Book of Common Prayer. The policy of comprehension, complaisant toward all Protestants, is the antithesis of the other policy of rigid loyalty to the principles of the historic Catholic Church. Bishop Lawrence represents the one, you the other. Both are 'probable opinions' in the Anglican Communion; both have the sanction of 'approved doctors'; both are held by many of our co-religionists: but they are contradictory and cannot long co-exist. Your view has more historical backing than the other; but in modern practice, in case of conflict, it

is your view which always has to yield. The Latitudinarian lion will only lie down with the Catholic lamb inside —if it bleats!

"The Cambridge incident raises no new question and forces no issue for me, merely illustrates the problem which has been troubling me for years and is demanding speedy solution as concerns myself in relation to my work."

If one thing more than another served to banish my faith in the Anglican Communion, it was recognition of the practical tolerance of every form of heresy and the conviction that this was due to an inherent and ineradicable tendency, to organic not functional disorder. Hence this was the first reason I assigned for abandonment of work. "After long struggle against the conviction, I have been forced to admit that this toleration of doctrinal laxity seems to me to indicate that the Church's Discipline fails to express and defend its Doctrine, and creates an insuperable difficulty for those who believe in the fundamental importance of the historic doctrine of the Incarnation."

In relation to sacramental teaching also I came eventually to feel that "inclusiveness is not a glory, but a give-away." Varieties in ritual never troubled me; varieties in faith did. One of the most striking phases in the experience of an Anglican Bishop is the constant change of air and temperature in his administration of Sacraments. Of necessity he carries much of his atmosphere with him: but, as he finds himself now confirming a class prepared to look on the ceremony merely as ratification of vows which constitute the chief signifi-

cance of Baptism, and again on the same day confirming another class presented in expectation of receiving the sevenfold gifts of the Holy Ghost; now celebrating the Eucharist in a church where priest and people believe in the Divine Eucharistic Presence, again in one in which Communion is viewed Zwinglian-fashion as a curious sign and suggestion of the death on Calvary; now in one in which the Eucharist is the central and customary act of worship, and again in another in which it is only an occasional, and rather tiresome, appendage to Morning Prayer—as he undergoes these and similar changes of doctrinal and devotional temperature, sudden transitions from the hot room to the cold plunge, he must reflect on the necessity of toughness in episcopal constitutions, and ask often, What does, and what doesn't, the Church teach? I have never been a "ritualist" in the sense of being dependent on, or attaching much importance to, externals. I have always been able to use or to dispense with them. But I have never been able to dispense with faith in the Sacraments as Divine Mysteries. Given this, it makes no difference how plain a service is; without it, no amount of music and ceremony count for anything. The one thing as Bishop I wished most to do was to celebrate the Holy Eucharist for my people. I could adapt myself to any surroundings without thought of them. During my first years in Delaware, I had no consciousness of difference in kind, though I recognized degrees, of belief as to what the Eucharist really is. Later I came to feel that in some places there was no conception of the Presence, the Sacrifice, or the actual Communion, that in instances

the ideas of these things were hated. I disliked to celebrate in an atmosphere of unbelief, and during my last two years avoided doing so. I recognized that to some the Zwinglian notion of bare signs came quite as naturally as to others the Catholic conception of the Mass; but I recognized also that it was the lowest terms, not the highest, of its sacramental teaching, which the Church's system actually served to propagate, and I ceased to believe in ambiguity of statement as the one mode of preserving balance of truth. It was this experience which eventually led me to give my second reason for resignation.

"The Episcopal Church permits and encourages a variety of views about Sacraments. Its standard, however, is determined by the minimum, rather than by the maximum view tolerated, since its official position must be gauged not by the most it allows but by the least it insists on. Its general influence has fluid qualities always seeking the lowest possible level. The stream of its life cannot rise higher than its source in corporate authority. Individual belief and practice may surmount this; but they will ultimately count for nothing so long as they find no expression in official action; nor can the Church be judged by the standard of individual members acting in independence of it.

"Like many others, I attach highest importance to the doctrines of Baptismal Regeneration, of the Real Presence in the Holy Eucharist, of the Eucharistic Sacrifice, of the sacramental character of Confirmation and Penance. All these doctrines the Church tolerates; but so long as equal toleration is given to others of a different or even neutraliz-

ing sort, this is not definitely to teach them. To tolerate everything is to teach nothing. Hence though individuals among us may urge the importance of these definite beliefs, they cannot claim the full authoritative backing of that portion of the Church to which they profess allegiance.

"The sacramental teaching of the Episcopal Church is non-committal, with the consequence that its official teachers are habitually vague in their utterances, and that the beliefs of many of its members are approximately or actually Zwinglian. A general policy of comprehension by reduction of requirements to lowest terms prevents conversion by raising to highest possibilities. Although there has been marked advance among some of our people owing to deeper hold of sacramental truth, there has been even greater retrogression among others toward rationalistic scepticism. On the whole, the Church seems to be swayed by the tendencies of the age opposed to the supernatural owing to ambiguities inherent in its system, always subject to an intellectual law of gravitation."

This statement of reasons for resignation represents a decision reached in 1919. The first stages of the process which led to it date from 1911 or 1912. In looking backward, I see in my withdrawal in 1911 from the executive committee of the World Conference on Faith and Order the beginning of giving up altogether. At the time I thought of it only as due to lack of sympathy with the policies of the moving spirits on the Commission, and to ill health which made travelling difficult. I see now that I was vaguely conscious of being out of sympathy with the Church's presuppositions. Shortly after, I withdrew from every Board, Committee, and Commission of which I was

member and refused to accept any subsequent appointments from General Convention or the Provincial Synod. After 1912, I confined myself to my diocese. It seemed to me that the procedure of the World Conference Commission was fundamentally wrong. My notion was that the initiative must come from the Catholic Church, which I conceived to be represented by the Roman, Eastern, and Anglican Communions; and of these I felt it to be of practical importance to induce the Roman to take the lead. I could not conceive that any such project could come to a successful issue except by reference first to the Catholic Communions, and some initial understanding between the Big Three. This now seems to me chimerical; but it was the only possible view I could have in 1911. The Conference Commission issued a general appeal to "Communions" for "Commissions," with the result of response from many Protestant bodies. This assumption that all "Communions" were on the same basis seemed to me to be based on individualistic principles which did not take account of the actual facts in the Christian world; it seemed to view Christendom as composed of the sporadically baptized who coalesced in congregations, which in turn combined to form communions, which, if federated, might form a Catholic Church. As practical policy as well as correct theory, I wished to begin with the Church not with the individual. I should not now attempt to defend my theory of the Church; and I now consider that the Commission not only was going about its work in the way expected, but was acting in accordance with the ecclesiastical

theory most in accord with Anglican precedent. But the method seemed to me to be an endeavor to piece together fragments of the circumference of the Christian world without reference to centre or radius. I was compelled to consider very carefully my exact relation to the plans of the Commission, as I had been elected Executive Secretary with presumably important responsibilities. In declining the Secretaryship, I expressed my misgivings as to the procedure adopted in a letter to the Reverend Dr. Manning.

XIX Trinity, 1911.

" I must ask you again, as I did last July, to convey to the Commission my reluctant declination of the post of Executive Secretary to which they did me the honor to elect me last spring. . . . I am not sure that I am sufficiently in accord with the rest of the Executive Committee to make it probable that I should be an effective Secretary. I must say frankly that I cannot give cordial assent to the report of April 20th. I think I do not take exception to any statement contained in it; but I fear I am not in agreement with some of its fundamental assumptions as to the method of approaching the great project we have undertaken. Some divergence there is between my own opinions and the presuppositions of the report; but as I was not present at the discussions which preceded its adoption, I cannot determine the exact degree. I think, however, that I can state shortly the main point of my disagreement.

" I take the aim of the World Conference very seriously, that sober effort is to be made to pave the way for a really ecumenical conference, an effort that can only be made by ecumenical methods. If we are at the outset to adopt these, we must not allow ourselves to be too greatly influenced

by the presuppositions of American Protestantism. American Protestants constitute only a fraction of the Christian world and a comparatively unimportant fraction at that. Their isolation makes it difficult to assume that their methods of working are identical with those of other portions of Christendom. If we allow our project to assume a distinctly American Protestant aspect, the moment we do so the hope of a World Conference will be lost.

"It seems to me there is danger of this in our indiscriminate use of the term 'Communions' and our indiscriminate appeal for 'Commissions' appointed by 'Conventions.' Such an appeal is natural enough in approaching American Protestant bodies, numbered by hundreds and all more or less congregational in character and methods of working; but it is not the natural sort of appeal to make to representatives of the great sections of the Holy Catholic Church, having diametrically opposed conceptions of ecclesiastical authority and different methods of procedure. . . . It is quite conceivable that a long list of American Protestant Commissions might represent not stages in, but obstacles to, real progress in a world-wide movement. American Protestantism must have its place in a World Conference and share in bringing it to pass; but it can only have such place and share as it is entitled to in a duly *proportioned* view of the whole of Christendom and the whole of Christian history. American Protestantism bulks large in our vision because we live in the midst of it; but we must adjust the vision to broad and distant views. If, as seems to me, there is something of distinctly Congregational presupposition in some of our action hitherto, we are in great danger of quickly demonstrating our utter inability to further the great object which we feel ourselves Providentially guided to undertake. A really representative General Commission will never be evolved out of a

'fortuitous concourse of atoms,' such as vague appeal for action by 'communions' can only evoke. If action is to be effective, there must be from the outset some *active principle of correlation.*"

Here follows detailed suggestion of a possible mode of procedure:

1. Formation of a General Committee; 2. American Inter-Church Congress; 3. United Appeal from American Christians for World Conference. "It seems to me conceivable that a representative of our Commission, presumably our Executive Secretary, might at this time seek to induce a body of ten or twelve, half Catholics and half Protestants, to draw up and sign a statement as to what is involved in belief in Jesus Christ as Lord and Saviour, and the reasons for making this the necessary basis for consideration of questions of Faith and Order. Such a statement would be of value, even if nothing else were done at present."

I was disposed to urge an American Conference as a practically possible preliminary to a World Conference.

"The Christian world would listen if representatives of all forms of American Christianity were to be able to say, 'We have accomplished something useful on a national scale; and this gives us confidence that something similar can be accomplished on an ecumenical scale!' The Pope, the Czar, and the Archbishop of Canterbury would be more likely to fall in line if they were confronted not with a theory but with a condition. They would be more impressed by an object-lesson, the value of which had been attested by their own people, than by statement of a mere amiable aspiration. It is probably the surest way, possibly the only

way, of making an impression on the Greek and Roman Churches, perhaps the surest way of gaining the co-operation of the Anglican Communion. . . . I think this in consequence of conversations I had last winter with the Archbishop of Canterbury and other English Bishops. . . .

"Some such method as I have indicated would seem to me the only sort likely to be effective. If I am mistaken, this will serve to show the Committee that I would not make a good Executive Secretary. At any rate, I am firmly convinced that nothing can be done until there is a balanced body of Catholics and Protestants ready to direct the first stages of the movement; and I fear that it is possible for us to hamper future action by anything which will prove one-sided in its effects, no matter how balanced it is in theory and intention."

At the same time I wrote to the Bishop of Chicago (Dr. Anderson), President of the Commission.

December 1, 1911.

"At the risk of seeming pessimistic, I am bound to say that I do not think we have yet done anything that counts for much in view of what we have in mind; and that we do not seem to have given any clear indication of apprehending the state of things in the Christian world as a whole. If we are not to wreck our chances of usefulness at the outset, there must be formulation of a definite policy which will control as well as guide the Commission's action. It does not seem to me that we can yet be said to have a policy. We have an amiable aspiration and a number of incoherent notions; but these do not constitute a policy: and the time has come when we ought to be making definite proposals instead of merely repeating the fine generalizations with which we started. We cannot be hurried into

premature declarations; but whatever we do and say ought to be related to some central conceptions based on sound knowledge of facts in the ecclesiastical world."

At the same time that I discovered that I was not *en rapport* with the World Conference Commission, I was finding myself in other ways not in sympathetic contact with movements in the Church; and I was doing much reading on the English Reformation which was modifying my historical views. Aggravated, if not caused, by worry over ecclesiastical questions, an illness that came on in 1911 depressed me very much. In the latter part of 1911, or early in 1912, I first considered the possibility of having to give up my work, ostensibily on the ground of ill health, really because I began to feel what J. S. Mill calls "the disastrous feeling of 'not worth while.'" As I wrote to some one at this time, "I am suffering from acute P.E.-itis."

I was more and more coming to recognize that what I had regarded as the real teaching and position of the Church were only representative of a tolerated party in the Church. I cared nothing for merely holding or propounding my own views, or for merely having my own way, as I could more freely than most others. I only cared for what officially I stood for and only wished to be received for what was signified by my office. As I came to feel that this represented only a system of futile compromise, much as I liked being "of Delaware," I came to dislike being "Bishop." Phillips Brooks, on first sitting in the House of Bishops, wrote:

"The Bishops are not very wise, nor very clever; but they think they are, and they very much enjoy being Bishops." I never qualified under these last conditions, and felt that there was something uncanny about those who did!

April 6, 1913.

"I am sorry you don't like the portrait (one painted by Mr. Ruel Crompton Tuttle, in 1912). I like it very much indeed. I quite admit that it looks like a bilious undertaker not yet recovered from the death of his third wife, that it is altogether lugubrious and woe-begone, that I don't think it looks like what I really am inside. But it does exactly image my feelings as a P. E. Bishop! Remember it is to be my official portrait at Bishopstead.

"'As when a painter poring on a face
Divinely through all hindrance finds the man,'

so Ruel Tuttle, scrutinizing my mug, has discovered my official emotions. The picture looks exactly like I feel when I am thinking about the way things are not going in the Church. I don't want it touched up or cheered up. Let it be as it is. Like Cromwell, let me be painted 'wart and all.' I cannot be beautiful and need not be cheerful; but let me in any case be historically accurate. A genuine artist has been able, first, to see things as they are, and, then, to depict what he has seen. I am glad he painted me in academicals. In years to come this will properly place me in the line of Bishops of Delaware, a sulky scarlet tanager in a bevy of complacent magpies. If ever I get out of this, I will be painted again; and then you will see me grinning like a Cheshire pussy!"

Episcopalianism is merely a form of Congregationalism, to which the "historic episcopate" forms an

anomalous adjunct. Congregationalism means ministerialism. Ministers are cast loose in society to establish or to hold personal followings; each is concerned to proclaim his own views and put in practice his own schemes. This tends to develop ministerial egotism and resolves church work into prosecution of parochial activities under special personal leadership. The one vital question is "Do you like the minister?" To like him, to attend his ministrations, and to co-operate in his schemes is to exhibit a high degree of piety: not to like him, to disparage him by contrast with his predecessor, and to be alert to oust him for a man of different type, is to exhibit a higher, since it is the virtue of Protestantism to protest. Episcopalian ministers are practically left to their own devices as much as any others. They are supposed to use the Prayer Book; their Congregationalism is supposed to be "tempered by episcopacy"; they are connected with a well-organized system which seeks to raise parochialism into diocesanism and this into broader churchmanship: but in fact there is little behind them to help or to hamper; they are thrown almost entirely upon their own resources, and personal popularity is the condition of success. If a minister is personally agreeable, his congregation is disposed to follow his lead in thought and parochial action; if his successor is also personally agreeable, they will with equal readiness follow him along quite different lines. The important thing is not church principles but ministerial manners. If the latter are winning, things will move apace, and there will be much parochial self-complacency. But work resolves itself into personal, paro-

chial followings; its divisions are those of pastorates; its continuity is precarious. In the Episcopal Church, some of the most conspicuous examples of applied individualism in ministerial free-lances are to be found in "Catholic parishes." This is inevitable. Those who believe they possess the Catholic priesthood and the Catholic episcopate are bound, by conditions of the Episcopalian system, to act as priests-at-random and bishops-at-large. I never could go about my work in this way. Much as I cared for the liking of people in Delaware and revelled in adding to my collection of friends, I never tried to build up work on the basis of a personal following. Congregational methods seemed to me a travesty on the true work of Bishops and Priests in the Church of God, to illustrate the effort to "raise an altar on one's own centre of gravity" and to be "a little Holy Catholic Church, all by one's self." I could never view every minority of one as an Athanasius, or feel that the one criterion of Catholic truth was that it should be held by only one person! I was never one of those Anglo-Catholics who can think of themselves each as *Athanasius contra—Ecclesiam. Ego contra: ergo Athanasius!*

During the latter part of 1912, I was definitely considering that it would possibly be my duty to resign my jurisdiction at the General Convention of 1913, and in January of 1913 I went to see the Bishop of Vermont (Dr. Hall) to ask his advice. From that time I kept him informed as to my ecclesiastical difficulties. The only letters I wrote on the subject at this time were

addressed to the Bishop of the Philippine Islands (Dr. Brent), who had written some things which made me wish to take him into my confidence.

October 8, 1912.

"My position would seem to be one of vantage and my task comparatively easy. I have a small, easily administered field, fair equipment for such work as has immediately to be done; and I was sent here to succeed one who consistently upheld Catholic ideals and tried to establish work on Catholic lines for twenty years. As tasks go, mine is comparatively simple; and as conditions go, mine on the whole are favorable. But in spite of determination to keep hopeful and seem cheerful, I believe I have really lost confidence in the ability of the Protestant Episcopal Church really to witness to Catholic Christianity in Delaware, or to expect that it will ever do anything other than develop a type of Protestantism less vulgar and somewhat less ignorant than Methodism. At the time of my consecration and for two years after, I believed enthusiastically in the mission of our church to develop Catholic Christianity for Americans, and that the Catholic interpretation of Anglicanism is the only reasonable one. But my wider experience of the Church has taught me two things, the actual Protestantism of the majority of our people and the really Protestant character of our historical antecedents. I have not lost my loyalty to the ideal I was taught in the Anglican Church. The older I grow, the more I feel that the ideals of Anglican Catholics are the noblest things I know; but I have ceased to feel that they can be regarded as those of the Church, or much more than the aspiration of a party using its Protestant private judgment in a Catholic direction. But for effective action we must have the *Church,*

not merely a party within the Church, behind us. I imagine you feel that. And unless the Church as a whole appropriates what hitherto has been the property of the Catholic party within it, I despair for the Church. And that the Anglican Communion ever will realize its potential Catholicity, I fear I have ceased to expect. I believe that we are on the brink of a crisis which will determine whether we are to pursue a Protestant or a Catholic career. I believe that it is more likely than not that the choice will be virtually Protestant. I am disillusioned about Protestantism. I do my best to think well of it and to work with it; but it is drearily unchristian. . . .

"I should be disposed to ascribe my own failure to do anything to defects in my own character, had I not constantly before me the example of my predecessor, worth ten of me, whose efforts seemed to come to nothing, because, though he was trying to do the work of a Catholic Bishop, he was after all only the agent of a Protestant Church, which is only somewhat ironically 'Episcopal.' I see so many examples of the failing of the work of good men whose stream of aspiration and energy was trying to rise higher than its source in Anglican history and principle. But enough of this. I am vehement and despondent. . . .

"I am seriously considering whether it may not be my plain duty to resign my jurisdiction at General Convention. I am a less than half-hearted Bishop now; and my diocese ought to have one who believes in the Protestant Episcopal Church. I have shown nothing of all this in my diocese; but of course it affects my work, no matter how hard I try to ignore it. If it strikes you that one in such a frame of mind ought not to retain a position of representative responsibility, please say so. I think I should not hesitate to remove myself, if it were apparently better for the diocese."

April 12, 1913.

"Nothing could have been more helpful than just what you have said and the way you have said it. Bishop Hall has been most kind and useful; but even he, in four days I spent with him in January, did not do more to restore my balance than you did in your letter. I think I was Providentially guided to open up myself to you at a time when I was in special need of the help you have given.

"The letter I wrote you truthfully represents what I have come to feel, and still feel, although it exaggerates the discouraging side of things. If I were to state the case now, I should say in substance precisely what I said before; but I should alter the proportion of emphasis. The thing that seems to me clearest is that the Catholic presentation of Christianity within the Anglican Communion is the best thing discoverable in the Christian world; but the thing most borne in on me in my work is that the Protestant Episcopal Church in the Diocese of Delaware constantly tends to ignore and suppress this, and in so doing has the preponderance of Anglican authority behind it. I am trying to get away from this last conviction and may succeed. I see plainly that Anglican Catholics have been guilty of exaggeration in trying to make out a case for themselves in claiming too much for the Catholic interpretation of Anglican history; and in the rebound from unintentional exaggeration of which I have myself been guilty, I am probably disposed to concede too much to the other side. I have also to be constantly reminding myself that my feeling of general dissatisfaction is more probably due to faults within myself than to faults everywhere in the world without! Moreover, I need constantly to remind myself that the Diocese of Delaware may not be as typical of the actual Anglican Communion as I am disposed to assume.

"1. I believe enthusiastically in the presentation of

Christianity as it has been taught me in the Anglican Church as the best approximate presentation for this country that I know.

2. I fully recognize the positive values of Protestantism in a general way; but I feel so strongly that the preponderating tendency is away from the supernatural, that I distrust it in all its forms. I think that its positive work is practically done, and that the chief thing now is to check its negations.

3. I have not the least touch of Roman fever. Actual Rome repels me. Its uncatholic features as contrasted with what I am familiar with in the Anglican Communion impress me more than its positive force and good qualities. There are three things which I should specify particularly: the Jesuit ethics with its wide-spread consequences, the lies about history officially taught, and the addition of dogmas. Nevertheless, I believe so firmly that Christianity is more at the heart of Catholicism in any form, no matter what the disguising exaggerations, than in any form of mere Protestantism, that I should consider it a Christian duty to submit to Rome's conditions, if there were no other Catholic alternative. In France or Germany, I should be a Roman Catholic; and I should be in America, if there were no better Catholicism to turn to.

"The practical conclusion at which I arrive is that it seems to be our first duty to secure for the Church a clearly Catholic official position. I do not think we have that. Our official position is ambiguous. If we were plainly making progress not in building up a Catholic party but in Catholicizing the Church, I should have no misgivings as to where lay the best hope for Christian America at this time. By that I mean that with us would lie the best hope of making a valuable contribution toward better things in future. This of course is what I wish to feel and hope to

feel. I have had to go through dark places of discouragement in work; but I may come out of them with stronger and soberer faith. If so, it will be largely due to Bishop Hall and yourself.

"I think General Convention this year will be of critical importance. I am not excited about change of name, chiefly because that seems a mere scratching on the surface. But the discussions about name have been, I think, useful in getting people to face facts and principles; and the outcome may be to make us see more clearly just where we stand. If the Protestants can make a case for the possession of the Church, I think that they will be able to do so soon. If they can, that will be a good thing. If, on the other hand, the Church can be made more worthy of its splendidly Catholic traditions, I believe that now is a time to make important contributions toward that end. There are certain definite things that we may be ready for, or ready to prepare for.

"(1) Unambiguous statement of the Real Presence.
(2) Recognition of Orders as a Sacrament.
(3) Prayers for the Dead.
(4) Dropping of the XXXIX Articles.

"I do not regard this as a sort of mere party warfare within the Church to the neglect of our widest responsibilities. I believe we can best help the cause of Unity by making ourselves exponents of the mystical side of Christianity in this country instead of leaving it all to Rome. We shall do most for our Presbyterian and Methodist friends by sloughing our own Protestantism. I am not in the least disposed to ignore what we have in common; but we have a special duty to provide what they have not, and also to emphasize what we have in common with Christians on the Catholic side."

Bishop Hall and Bishop Brent encouraged me and for the time being quieted my misgivings; but I find repetition of the same thoughts in a letter to the Bishop of Oxford in the following year acknowledging a copy of his charge on *The Basis of Anglican Fellowship.*

St. Barnabas' Day, 1914.

"Our problems are different from problems in England in the forms they take, though substantially they are the same. The Kikuyu incident has not directly affected us; but some of our leading laymen are urging recognition of a Federation of Churches in a way that raises the same issues. We have our own difficulties on three sides. What you have said, and your way of saying it, in this instance as in others, is of great value to us.

"Our Church is clearly on trial, more clearly than at any other time in its history. There are many indications that it may yield to Protestant tendencies to lose grip on the supernatural, and forfeit its right to claim identity in principle with the ancient Church. On the other hand, the time of controversy, apparently just ahead of us, may issue in clearer apprehension of the principles of the Faith. Some storms are probably better for us than the hazy calm in which we have been drifting about hitherto. We seem to have failed to teach our people as a whole what the Creed means.

"I often think that, if I were beginning afresh, I should be a Roman Catholic, as seeming to have in the Roman Communion the best opportunity, all things considered, to uphold the basic principles of Christianity in this country. I cannot conceive there being no difficulties; but it seems easier to tolerate additions and multiplications than subtractions and divisions, easier to ignore exaggerations than

dilutions! The feeling of discouragement at the outlook for our Church in America and for my Diocese makes it possible to appreciate the value of clear and strong utterances such as yours."

My perplexities and ponderings on them in 1912 and 1913 were prophetic intimations of my decisions seven years later; but, as I wrote the Bishop of Vermont at that time, I was "suffering not from Roman fever, but from Protestant chills."

CHAPTER VII

THE ENGLISH REFORMATION

During 1912 and the three years following, I did what reading I could on the English Reformation, and found it necessary to revise many earlier judgments. For one thing, the practical necessity of knowing what I could teach in my diocese as having the sanction of the Church's authority, led me to ask afresh, "What is the actual teaching of the Church of England, and our own, about Sacraments?" For another, I was set to thinking along new lines by Dr. Gairdner's *Lollardy and the English Reformation* and by Bishop and Gasquet's *Edward VI and the Book of Common Prayer*, the only book by Roman Catholic writers that put new notions into my head. Many Roman Catholic books that I have recently read have corroborated, put into words, explained more fully, things that I had been finding out for myself; but, with this one exception, the opinions I now hold of the Anglican position have been derived solely from considering the facts as I have been able to learn them from sources and from Anglican writers. In my teaching years, I always combated the theory that the English Reformation was to be bracketed with the Continental or the Scottish, the theory well set forth in the Cambridge Modern History. I have now come to hold this as the more correct interpretation of the facts, chiefly owing to the fact that I

have made careful study of the publications of the Parker Society. The Anglo-Catholic version of Reformation facts cannot be squared with the revelations of that collection of weary, dreary documents.

In writing *Outlines of Church History* for the New York Sunday School Commission in 1914, I repeated the Catholic interpretation of the Anglican position which I had always believed and taught, though with some modifications: when in 1917 I was asked to do another bit of historical work on the same period, I had to refuse, as I no longer felt that my presentation of facts was justified, and it was this that I was asked to give. I have always wished to face facts fairly and interpret them cautiously, never, I think, consciously suppressing or distorting them to serve a partisan purpose. It seems to me that, in my historical work, I have always had a sincere desire to get at the truth. I have wished to avoid the blinding influence of prejudice and frankly to admit everything that told against my own contentions. I am quite certain of the honesty of my motives: but I have come to see that in many things I have been mistaken, and that, without knowing it, I have let prejudices color my view of facts.

The general view of the English Reformation which I believed to be the true one, the one given in anything that I have published, is thus summarized in the *Outlines of Church History.*

"The English Reformation is to be carefully distinguished from the Reformation movements on the Continent of Europe. The Saxon and Swiss movements, inaugurated

by great individuals, caused definite breaches with the past, on the assumption that Christianity as it existed in the earliest days had perished from the earth. The assumption of Luther, and still more of Calvin, was that whatever existed was more or less wrong, and that the faith of the Gospels could only be proclaimed as a fresh discovery. They wished to be as far as possible from the religious system of western Europe as it existed in their day, and made little or no pretence of preserving continuity of religious ideas and institutions. They wished to destroy and build afresh. In England, however, the aim was to adapt and modify. The English Reformation represents not the following of conspicuous individuals, but the acts of a national Church. The Church of England, dating from the end of the sixth century, after a thousand years of life in which it reflected all aspects of the life of western Christendom, in the sixteenth century made certain important changes in its ways, which involved its isolation from the rest of the Christian world. It was separated from the communion of the western Churches in communion with Rome; yet it never made such radical changes as to identify itself with the reformed bodies on the Continent. The justification for its isolation has been that this was compelled by circumstances, and that its principles are such as well express the faith of the primitive Church in a form intelligible to the modern world. The history of the English Reformation falls into two periods, the first, 1509-1570, during which the Church of England readjusted its relations toward the see of Rome; the second, 1558-1665, during which it determined its attitude toward the Puritans." *

" It is a mistake to think that the English Reformation is concerned only with the Church of England's renunciation

* *Outlines,* p. 51.

of the papal claims. The first stage of the history is concerned with this and shows the abandonment by England of the system of Christianity which had prevailed in western Europe during the Middle Ages, though the change is one of modification rather than of destruction. There is a second division of the history which clearly marks the difference between the changes made in England and those that had been made in Germany and Switzerland. The question was inevitably raised, If England breaks with Rome, will she not cast in her lot with Wittenberg or Geneva? This question was given definite form, when Calvin's followers tried to compel England to accept the Genevan system, as Scotland had done at the instigation of John Knox. The English Calvinists are those commonly known as Puritans; and the history of the English Church for over a century was determined by her efforts to defend herself against Puritan attack." *

It is perhaps inevitable that one of New England antecedents, always conscious of Puritan antagonism to " Prelacy " and all its works, should think of Anglicanism more as anti-Puritan than as anti-Roman. Yet close scrutiny of the facts will show that, in spite of the long war between Calvinists and Anglicans, the differences between them often concern names rather than things, and that the conclusion of many of their conflicts left what was Puritan in substance, though tagged by Anglicans with an ancient name. In the *Outlines of Church History* there is one paragraph which marks a great modification in my earlier views.

* *Outlines,* p. 61.

"It is to the 'Elizabethan Settlement' that the Anglican Communion owes a characteristic quality, sometimes regarded as an excellence, but more justly as a weakness. This is its habitual ambiguity. It aimed at comprehension; and it ended in compromise. The practical object of Elizabethan Churchmen was to maintain the English Rite as against both Papists and Puritans who wished to overthrow it, and yet give it such a form as to ensure its use by as many as possible on either side. More especially did they feel the need of concession to the Puritan party as being the more aggressive of their opponents. The consequence was that they drew up the Articles of Religion which were susceptible of various interpretations; and in their effort to be just to different degrees of emphasis and different aspects of generally accepted truths, they too often tried to harmonize utterly incompatible views and involved themselves in contradictions. Principle yielded to policy; alleged charity sacrificed sincerity. The habit of non-committal evasiveness formed by the Church of England at this time has been a great drawback to its usefulness; and Anglicans have justly been charged with incoherence in teaching and inconsistence in practice. It is characteristic of the English people to avoid clear statement of principles through confidence in the ultimate success of a policy of muddle. This has impressed itself on English Church history." *

In teaching the history of the Reformation, the line I took was always something like this. The mediæval Church was fascinating in many ways; it was not as black as it has been painted, not hopelessly corrupt, though grown very worldly: yet it represented but

* *Outlines*, p. 65 f.

transient phases of Christian development, had outgrown its usefulness, on the whole deserved to be superseded. Its characteristic products, scholastic theology, and the Papal system, were purely mediæval, with mediæval limitations, and could not be altogether justified either by primitive standards or by modern needs. Change was inevitable and desirable. The Reformation, like all periods of transition, was marked by violence and destruction. The Reformers were without exception unattractive characters, some of them detestable. On the Continent, religious change took the form of radical departure from primitive Christian principle and cannot be defended. Yet in England there was no sacrifice of essentials, though there were many deplorable changes, and a succession of unlovely leaders. Henry VIII was a brute, Cranmer a poltroon, the Privy Council of Edward VI unscrupulous thieves, Elizabeth an accomplished liar, her divines for the most part a sorry lot. The only heroic figures were some of the martyrs for the Old Religion like Bishop Fisher and Sir Thomas More, though there were many good too among upholders of the New Religion such as Latimer, more respectable than Cranmer and Ridley, and such Elizabethans as Jewel, Hooker, and Andrewes. The seventeenth century was somewhat better, with saintly characters among the Caroline divines, though it is not possible to be altogether enthusiastic over the martyrs, King Charles and Laud. It was not an alluring record; yet, on the whole, represented necessary and desirable change, its characteristic product and justification being the Prayer Book. In the Liberal Catholicism of the

English Church was to be found the best guarantee of adherence to Catholic principle and of a basis for the reunion of the Christian world.

I began by assuming the approximate goodness of Anglicanism, and ended by teaching this as an historical conclusion, failing to see that my conclusion was drawn from the presupposition, not the facts. I saw the unsatisfactory character of these and tried truthfully to state them, yet tried to deduce from them more than they warrant. Gasquet pricked the bubble of my illusions. I know of no writer who more clearly calls attention to the truth concerning certain aspects of the English Reformation. While, in one sense, I have learned little from him, since his general presentation of the facts is merely what any of my old pupils would recognize as substantially identical with that which I gave myself in seminary lectures; yet I owe more to him than to any other writer for corroboration of what I held tentatively, for completion of what I only knew in part, and for putting me in the way of finding for myself the discrepancy between the actual history and the conclusions which I wished to draw from it.

It was in consequence of fresh studies stimulated by the recent reading of Gairdner and Gasquet, that in June 1912 I wrote a paper for a clerical Conference at St. Mary's School, Raleigh, North Carolina, on *Anglican Ambiguity*, in which I pointed in detail the twofold aspect of Anglican teaching about the Eucharist and Orders. The paper began with the sentence, "The subject of this paper is irritating, as is appropriate, as its purpose is to call attention to facts more

than irritating to those who make strong claims for the Catholicity of the Anglican Church"; and its conclusion was:

"We need more clearly to apprehend, or to determine afresh, what our principles are, and then plainly avow them. We need to remember that lukewarmness results not only from being neither cold nor hot, but also from being both cold and hot at the same time. Whether it comes by negation or by double assertion, lukewarmness in the Church is a vice, and the penalty decreed against it is rejection. There is among us too much saying Yea and Nay together. Yet St. Paul reminds us: 'As God is true, our word toward you was not Yea and Nay. For the Son of God, Jesus Christ, Who was preached among you by us, was not Yea and Nay: but in Him was Yea. For all the promises of God in Him are Yea, and in Him Amen, unto the glory of God by us.' (II Cor. 1:18-20.) This means among other things that it is the duty of the Church to make clear statements of positive truth. It is well for us to consider these things, because it rests with us to try to rid our Church and Communion of an incoherence in teaching on some points, which has given ground for not undeserved reproach."

This paper of 1912 indicates the lines along which my mind was to work for several years to come. At that time, I felt that the Anglican teaching about Sacraments was sound enough, and unmistakable if one would study the Prayer Book; but I recognized the "double witness" of history and formularies, and felt that the doubtfulness on various points should be removed. I felt that much of the ambiguity was accidental and unintentional, something belonging to the

Church's outward life, not to its inner spirit. Seven years later, I came to regard this as proof that the Church had no clear principles as distinct from its obscure policies, and that in the matter of Sacraments not to affirm traditional teaching was virtually to deny it. In 1912, however, I should have had hopes of gain through Prayer Book revision which later were entirely lost.

In July 1913, I had to deliver a course of lectures before a conference of church workers held at the Cathedral of St. John the Divine, New York. I wished to include the paper on *Ambiguity* read in Raleigh; but I showed it to my friend Dr. Manning, who did not wish me to read it. Yielding to his insistence I gave up my intention, and overnight wrote a paper on *Sacramental Character,* which appears as the third of the four lectures, printed shortly after under the title *Catholic and Protestant.*

In 1915, a discussion arose about the Church's participation in the Panama Conference; and partly for the sake of backing up some of my friends who were under fire, and partly for the sake of letting my diocese know my attitude on certain proposed policies of the Church, I published a Charge to the Delaware Clergy on *The Issues before the Church.* In this I stated my position as carefully as I could, and in an appendix included much of the substance of the paper on *Ambiguity* to illustrate certain historical points. To myself this Charge represented an effort to test the tenability of my own position. I remember saying to myself when it came out, "*Ballon d'essai.*" In it I let my

diocese know, as I felt it was entitled to know, where I stood, although I knew my views would not be popular; but as it served to define my position for the time and two years to come, it gave me more satisfaction as a straightforward record of my position than anything else I had published.

The object of this pamphlet was to urge a clear-headed and firm stand for the Anglo-Catholic position; yet, as contrasted with earlier utterances such as my first Charge to my diocese, it shows that I had come to regard this as tentative, rather than as obviously assured, and to face the possibility that the Church might in practice repudiate it.

"Panama is the South American way, and Kikuyu the Central African way, of propounding the same query: Is the Anglican Communion Protestant or Catholic? It is strange that a great religious body should so frequently be perplexed as to its own identity, and seem to be the victim of ecclesiastical aphasia. The root of the trouble lies in the constitutional ambiguity of Anglicanism; and until this be treated by some drastic remedies, we must expect frequent attacks of the same malady. The necessity of clearer definition of principles seems to be forced upon us; and clearer definition of any sort ought in some way to add to the effectiveness of the Church." *

"Too long has Anglicanism rested on 'the Elizabethan Settlement,' which was quite the reverse of a settlement, being no more than a workable makeshift adopted in a troubled time, the ecclesiastical counterpart of the politic

* *Issues*, p. 10.

coquetry habitually practiced by the Virgin Queen. We have been coquetting long enough; it is time to declare our serious intentions. . . . We have inherited a general position in which we believe as approximately truthful and as relatively useful; we must develop it and improve on it if we can. One of its defects is uncertainty. Now is a time when something may be done to get rid of this.

"It is much to be desired that we get away from the old policy of trying to assent to everything, of trying to agree with everybody, even in cases of views directly opposed. The double witness does not stand searching tests for us any more than for Lear. 'To say "ay" and "no" to everything I said! "Ay" and "no" too was no good divinity. When the rain came to wet me once and the wind to make me chatter, when the thunder would not peace at my bidding, there I found them out, there I smelt them out. Go to; they are not men of their words; they told me I was everything; 'tis a lie. I am not ague-proof.' Considered merely as policy, straightforwardness and sincerity are better than non-committal evasiveness and amiable duplicity." *

"I have stated that a more definite declaration of principles either way would be a good thing for the Anglican Communion. My main object is to urge that the definitions ought to take the form of demonstrating more plainly her right to claim a position among the Catholic communions of the Christian world. . . . There is nothing eccentric in the Catholic interpretation of the Anglican position. It has not only always been tolerated, but is, if we think seriously, the only one that is really tolerable. . . . If I differ from others, it would be merely in the conviction that it ought to be more unequivocally asserted in the formularies

* *Issues*, p. 12 f.

and practices of the Church. Many think the old easy-going, non-committal policy a good one. I don't. Many think it not desirable that there should be a clearer avowal of principles. I do. I believe that we can only do useful service in the development of American Christianity, if we take strong and consistent stand on Catholic ground. To take a more definite stand—either on Catholic or Protestant ground—would doubtless cause some present inconvenience, quite probably loss of adherents. Yet is is better to stick to principles and let consequences take care of themselves: in the long run we and our work will be gainers by straightforwardness." *

"There is some ground for the charge that Anglicanism is nondescript Christianity, neither fish, flesh, nor fowl, but a sort of bat in the ecclesiastical firmament, with a bat's proverbial limitations of vision." †

While at this time, in thinking of policies of the Church, I was constantly harping on sins and disadvantages of "ambiguity," in my historical studies I was thinking chiefly of Anglican "continuity." Gasquet had suggested pertinent subjects for meditation; and even before I read his *Edward VI and the Book of Common Prayer*, I had had misgivings about "continuity" suggested under circumstances when I should least have expected them.

During the winter of 1911, I made a three weeks' visit to England, the special object of which was to receive an honorary Doctorate of Divinity from the Uni-

* *Issues*, p. 4 f.
† *Ibid.*, p. 54.

versity of Oxford.* I was immensely pleased with the degree, had a delightful visit in Oxford as guest of the Warden of Keble, and later paid visits to the Bishop of Salisbury (Dr. Wordsworth), to the Bishop of Birmingham (Dr. Gore), to Mrs. Creighton at Hampton Court Palace, and to the Archbishop of Canterbury (Dr. Davidson) at Lambeth, where I had a long talk with the Archbishop on the proposed World Conference on Faith and Order, and saw much of the Bishop of Oxford (Dr. Paget). It was the most interesting three weeks I ever spent, filled with pleasant experiences, all tending to make me thankful for my connection with the Church of England, and suggesting possibilities of useful and delightful contact in future.

* Dr. Ince, Regius Professor of Divinity, whose official duty it would have been to present for the Divinity degree, had recently died; and his successor, Dr. Scott Holland, had not yet come into residence. It became therefore the duty of the Regius Professor of Pastoral Theology, Dr. Ottley, to act as presenter; and as he had been Principal of the Pusey House when I lived there, this was specially pleasant for me. His presentation was made in the following words:

"Insignissime Vice-Cancellarie vosque egregii procuratores: Mos nobis pro lege est ut alumnos, in episcopatum elevatos, summo honoris academici gradu ornemus. Jucundiore autem affectu eos amplectimur qui nobis non civitate quidem, verum affinitatis et amicitiae vinculis, arctissime conjuncti sunt.

"Egregius hic praesul quem vobis (absente Sacrae Theologiae professore regio) praesento, ortu Americanus, apud suos liberalibus artibus puer institutus, postea collegio Keblensi apud nos commensalis ascriptus est. Deinde in patriam reversus, et sacris ordinibus initiatus, in diocesi Massachutiensi curam pastoralem exercuit; post aliquot annos in seminario theologico apud Novum Eboracum historiae ecclesiasticae professor constitutus est. In quo munere ita se strenuum et ec-

Yet to this visit, when I was least expecting such impressions, belonged certain uncomfortable thoughts of the breaking of Catholic continuity at the English Reformation. In St. Paul's Cathedral, noting the incongruity of the surplice as vestment for a celebrant in such a place, I was set to thinking of the significance of the abolition of Eucharistic Vestments; the portraits at Lambeth set me thinking of the historical significance of "magpie"; in Lincoln Cathedral, and again at York, I was struck by the inadequacy of the modern rite of Holy Communion, and much more of Evensong, to make use of the magnificent minsters built by monks for the Mass; in Durham I meditated on the "Nine Altars," and in Edinburgh felt how the Scottish Kirk,

clesiae fructuosum exhibuit, ut tribus abhinc annis ad episcopatum ascitus, diocesi Delavarensi sit praepositus. Neque tamen inter episcopatus ardua officia et multiplices curas priora studia omisit. Immo librum recenter conscripsit in quo de Anglicanae ecclesiae juribus, doctrina, disciplinae ratione, perite disputabatur. Itaque jure optimo auguramur nullo hunc loco ecclesiae defuturum: neque in consiliis de salute eius capiendis, neque in ministerii laboribus viriliter perferendis.

"Academia nostra regnorum, gentium, civitatum diversitates nescit. Quod Pericles ille de Athenis suis, id de Oxonia nostra affirmare ausim: *συμβαίνει ἡμῖν μηδὲν οἰκειοτέρᾳ τῇ ἀπολαύσει τὰ αὐτοῦ ἀγαθὰ γινόμενα καρποῦσθαι ἢ καὶ τὰ τῶν ἄλλων ἀνθρώπων* [Thucydides 2, 28]. Ne ergo nationi et genti amplissimae, e stirpe nostra oriundae; ne ecclesiae fraterni nobis vinculo amoris conjunctae; ne nostro denique alumno, militiam Christi strenue gerenti, pignus quantulumcunque benevolentiae mostrae et caritatis desit: praesento vobis praesulem reverendissimum Fredericum Josephum Kinsman, artium magistrum, ut admittatur ad gradum Doctoris in sacra Theologia honoris causa."

by its possession of the mediæval churches, suggests a superficial continuity with the mediæval Church comparable to that in the Church of England.

It was suggestions made by this visit that account for comments on "continuity" to be found in papers written in 1912 and 1913.

"The Church of England's possession of the ancient churches and revenues gives a semblance of continuity not wholly in accord with facts. Continuity of buildings does not prove continuity of principle. Consider the significance of 'The Nine Altars' of Durham Cathedral. The 'Nine Altars' were, I believe, erected in the thirteenth century and dedicated to the memories of some of the finest of the Northumbrian saints. They may have succeeded nine altars earlier still. At any rate, from the thirteenth century until the twentieth there have always been 'Nine Altars' in the east end of Durham Cathedral. There has been absolutely no break in continuity of name. This nominal permanence sometimes blinds people to the fact that a clear distinction must nevertheless be drawn between the centuries during which there were nine actual altars, daily used for celebrations of the Holy Eucharist, and the three centuries during which there have been but nine holes in the surrounding walls! Continuity of walls and of name must not obscure the fact that in the sixteenth century the nine altars were smashed, and that in the twentieth they have not been restored. The 'Nine Altars' of Durham illustrate by parable the actual condition of many things in the Anglican Church.

"There has been over-emphasis on 'continuity' by writers on English Church history. It was long popularly supposed that the Roman Catholic Church was wholly abolished in England in order that a brand-new Protestant

Church might be set up in its place. To combat this fallacy ecclesiastical writers have rung the changes on 'continuity.' Some curiously have urged that the Church of England was very Protestant all through the Middle Ages and that, apparently in consequence, she must be regarded as having been very Catholic ever since! Neither contention is borne out by facts." *

It was not only on this English visit that I had thoughts of the unsatisfactory significance of "the episcopal habit" at times when I might have been expected to hold it in veneration. In February 1909, I had been Bishop but a few months, was still conscious of my "robes" as indicating the apostolic office, and had just been presented to the House of Bishops. The Bishops were assembled in Calvary Church, New York, for the Eucharist which preceded the election of Bishops for Wyoming and western Colorado. As I watched the Presiding Bishop and his assistants flitting like white-winged bats about the dim sanctuary, I saw for the first time how grotesque the English "episcopal habit" is, and was set to thinking what the changes from copes, mitres, and Eucharistic Vestments to chimeres and balloon sleeves meant. Not then, but later, I came to think of it not merely as a sign of poor taste, but as indication of an actual change in the conception of episcopate and priesthood. Priests divested themselves of the symbols of the unique and sacrificial character of the Mass, Bishops of the symbols of spiritual authority. The latter for the sake of not

* *Issues*, p. 24 f.

seeming to arrogate authority over King and laity, and also for the sake of conciliating Protestants, invested themselves in quasi-Genevan gloom. The garb of Cranmer and Ridley was the badge of Anglican subservience to civil authority and to Puritan prejudice. I came ultimately to dislike my episcopal vestments, not because they were ugly, but because of their historical significance. I wore them, and wished to wear them, because the Church had put me into them; and I did not wish to assume anything other than what was officially given me. But I always felt that they advertised the fact that, though I was called "Bishop," I was not one of the same kind as those of ancient days. Yet this did not indicate special regard for externals as such, merely that I felt that these particular externals plainly signified a fact to be deplored.

The change in vestments was a minor matter, though illustrating a great one. As I came eventually to feel that in the English Reformation there had been real breaches in the continuity of what was essential to the Catholicity of the Church, I considered chiefly: (1) changes involved in the recognition of Royal Supremacy, (2) changes in the Ordinal, (3) changes in the Mass, and incidentally (4) the obscuration of Penance, and (5) change in what constituted "the mind of the Church." My first concern with these was not to relate them to Roman claims, but to ancient principles as they would now be interpreted by the Eastern Church. I came to recognize that the burden of responsibility for the Anglican schism must be placed on Cranmer, Henry VIII, and Elizabeth, and although, at the time

of the publication of *Outlines of Church History*, I still held to my old belief that the Anglican Churches constitute a "Catholic Communion," by 1917 I had ceased to bracket them with Easterns and Old Catholics, but rather with the Danish Church and Scottish Kirk, and, for especially close parallels, with the Church in Sweden.

I had always insisted strongly that Henry VIII was merely an "occasion," not a "cause."

"The actual question raised by discussion of 'the King's Matter' was whether the Archbishop of Canterbury's court was not independent in a certain respect of the Pope. The criticism which resulted from the raising of this question led to a readjustment of all existing ecclesiastical institutions. The nature of this criticism in raising new standards, or in restoring old standards, of authority is the significant fact of the whole incident. The chief importance of the royal rebellion against the Pope was that it afforded no opportunity for the free play of the spirit of the New Learning." *

"Henry's motives and methods of conducting his quarrel were bad; but the historical examination of the papal claims resulting from his wish showed quite plainly that the papal claims as they had existed from the eleventh century or even earlier, represented not, as was generally supposed, part of the original institution of Christianity, but an ecclesiastical and political development, the stages of which could be clearly traced." †

* *Anglicanism*, p. 16.
† *Outlines*, p. 55.

Yet though I tried to thrust responsibility for the English schism on Hildebrand, I held no brief for Henry. "Henry overthrew the papal tyranny not in the interests of fuller liberty for the Church, but that he might establish a royal tyranny more intolerable still. In matters of discipline he acted as his own Pope, and by various arbitrary acts oppressed the Church." *

I wished to see the spirit of the English Reformation especially embodied in Erasmus (!), but ultimately had to admit that there is no getting away from Anne Boleyn. The brutality of her husband and caprices of her daughter forced revolutionary change on the English Church. I should now admit the accuracy of Cobbett's violent statement that "the Reformation was engendered in lust, brought forth in hypocrisy and perfidy, and cherished and fed by plunder, devastation, and by rivers of innocent English and Irish blood."

1. I never accepted the partisan view that there was no separation of England from Catholic unity until Pius V excommunicated Elizabeth, thereby making Rome schismatic by breaking from the centre of the Church represented by England! Yet believing in the untenability of papal claims and the dangers of Curial politics, I felt there was a strong case for the English position. Recently I have more fairly faced the facts. The simple truth is that the provinces of Canterbury and York, under compulsion of the English King, cut themselves loose from Catholic Christendom, and more and more, partly by choice, more as victims of violence,

* *Anglicanism*, p. 16.

assimilated themselves to Lutheran and Calvinistic standards. The plea of conformity to primitive standards did not alter the wilfulness of the separation.

Schism is the voluntary isolation of superior persons, and hence was an easy sin for those endowed with insular complacence. There was plenty of this in the sixteenth century. As the Venetian ambassador wrote home: "The English are great lovers of themselves and of everything belonging to them; they think that there are no other men but themselves and no other world but England, and whenever they see a handsome foreigner they say, 'he looks like an Englishman,' or that 'it is a great pity he should not be an Englishman.' When they partake of any delicacy with a foreigner they ask him 'whether such a thing is made in his country.'" * Henry VIII forced the Church of England to separate itself from Catholic Christendom because he wanted to marry Anne Boleyn; the Privy Council persisted in separation because they wanted excuses for plunder; Elizabeth made the breach final to ensure her own possession of the throne: eventually the English people accepted the religion, adopted from royal policy and enforced by parliamentary forms, as their own and believed in it on the assumption of the superiority of everything English. It is impossible not to concede that insular complacence is the genius of Anglicanism.

In spite of all temptations, that belong to other nations,
He remains an Englishman:
And by magnifying smirches, that attach to other churches,
He persists an Anglican.

* Quoted in Gasquet: *England under the Old Religion,* p. 19.

On two occasions the Bishop of North Carolina (Dr. Cheshire) put to me the question, "Is there any warrant in history for National Churches?" That is for the National Church as the embodiment of Catholic unity. This is not only the Anglican, but also largely an Eastern assumption. The principle *Cuius regio, eius religio* has a large background and much historical illustration: but analysis of its applications will usually show clearly that "national Churches" are political schisms. As arguments against papal supremacy, I had always favorably regarded signs of national independence in France and Spain as well as in England and the East: but I now see how in all these there are elements of aggression by secular authority and obvious loss of spiritual freedom for the Church.

The authority exercised by the Pope in England, as elsewhere in the West, consisted chiefly of two things: the Pope instituted all Bishops, and the Pope was supreme Ecclesiastical Judge. If, in repudiating papal supremacy, effort had been made to recognize that ultimate authority for doctrine and jurisdiction rested with the episcopate as a whole, there would have been approximate agreement with the Eastern assumption of the ultimate authority of a General Council. This was not done. Elizabeth had her Parliament pass an Act depriving the Pope of these powers in England; and she annexed them to the Crown. She made herself supreme judge in ecclesiastical matters by causing appeals from the Archbishop's court to be made to the Crown, and made the Crown also source of jurisdiction by assum-

ing the right to overrule the special authority of the Archbishop in case of his refusal to consecrate a royal nominee. The royal assumption of being source of jurisdiction appears plainly in the forms of the letters patent granted to colonial Bishops.*

In this there was a distinct breach in continuity of ecclesiastical principle. Hitherto spiritual jurisdiction had had a spiritual source. This principle had been vindicated in the various controversies over investiture. It is distinct from the special applications of it in the papal system, and to contravene it is subversive of any theory of the Church as hierarchical, of episcopacy no less than of papacy. Continental Protestantism in various ways combated the hierarchical principle; this was done in England by Royal Supremacy. Not that effort was not made in appearance to protect it. The sovereign, as "Supreme Head" or "Supreme Governor" of the Church, disclaimed such spiritual authority as would be indicated in the administration of Sacraments. He was merely "a supreme civil power over all persons and causes in temporal things, and over the temporal accidents of spiritual things," "a Churchman acting Churchmanly." It may be that efforts were made to safeguard principle in the matter of jurisdiction; but whatever the theory, the fact was that the ancient customs did not prevail. Assuming that the papacy represented usurpation of authority over the episcopate, this was not cured by transferring the usurped authority to the Crown, even though there was

* See discussion of this point in Allies: *See of Peter*, Chap. VI.

by acquiescence, a virtual abdication on the part of the newly-imposed episcopate. Papal supremacy at the most represented disproportionate application of an ecclesiastical principle true in itself; Royal Supremacy represented its overthrow. Regulation of the Church by the State, "establishment" with necessary accommodations for the sake of co-operation, touch no principle: the subjection of the Church to the State destroys its freedom. There is no getting away from the facts, that, in England of the sixteenth century, ecclesiastical changes were imposed by secular authority; that the "New Religion" was State-made; and that, in spite of efforts to safeguard theory, ultimate authority was vested in the Crown. The Crown appoints and determines the jurisdiction of bishops who exist to carry out the ecclesiastical policies of the State. In theory, cathedral chapters may refuse to elect, and bishops to consecrate, royal nominees; and the Crown may in making nominations be guided solely by considerations of doctrinal soundness and ecclesiastical fitness: but these things never have happened in the English Establishment, and in the nature of things never can happen. The ecclesiastical system "by law established" in England destroyed the freedom whereby alone the Catholic Church can be loyal to the Catholic Faith.

The ordinary workings of the Established Church have been modified, or suspended, in self-governing colonies of the British Empire; they have no direct bearing on the Episcopal Church in Scotland, where the British sovereign is head of the Scottish Kirk; they

may well seem to have no relation to the Episcopal Church in the United States, which has been free of all official connection with the British crown since the declaration of American independence. In America there might well be—to use an expression much in use by those interested in securing Bishop Seabury's consecration—" a free, valid, and purely ecclesiastical Episcopate." Though the validity of the American episcopate stands or falls with that of the English line from which it is derived, yet it might claim freedom and an ecclesiastical character quite its own. The Connecticut Churchmen and others like-minded were intent on securing the episcopate in accordance with ancient principles and of ending the disadvantages of legal establishment. Bishop Seabury aimed at being what Charles Wesley called him, in distinction from the " episcopate " inaugurated by his brother John, " a Real and Primitive Bishop." It may therefore be urged that primitive principles were decisive in the action taken by American Episcopalians in 1789.

Churchmen of the eighteenth century knew little about primitive principles. They had little opportunity to do so. Although many of the S.P.G. missionaries were men of good education, they had little opportunity for learned pursuits in America; and the conditions of their work merely familiarized them with congregationalism. Congregational principles were not only acted on by those who avowedly professed them; but were inevitable under American conditions. Moreover congregationalism is the ecclesiastical counterpart of democracy; and the development of democratic govern-

ment in secular affairs naturally favored congregational evolution in arrangements for religious affairs.

The last quarter of the eighteenth century was *par excellence* a period of paper-constitutions. American life in most of its phases was reorganized under terms of new charters. Religious bodies, almost without exception, illustrated the spirit and tendency of the time. Most of them organized congregations into State federations, ultimately combining in larger groups, sometimes nation-wide in extent: they held many conventions and congresses and adopted constitutions. One group of congregations to do this first and most effectively was the Episcopalian. No religious body comprised in its nominal membership more who played prominent parts in the inauguration of the American Republic; and the acquaintance and co-operation of these men in national affairs had its influence on the organization of their Church. It was the most natural thing in the world that their ideas of ecclesiastical organization should conform closely to political. Hence it was that the Episcopalians arranged for State conventions composed of delegates elected by congregations, for a General Convention composed of duly elected State delegates, and adopted a Constitution, the provisions of which conformed as closely as possible to those of the Constitution of the United States. This represented a new departure, resting ultimately on the authority of the membership of Episcopalians, a minority of whom were communicants, whose wishes might be assumed as registered through accepted processes of

elections, conventions, adoptions, and ratifications. The system was essentially democratic, congregational: it was adopted without reference to canon law, English, Papal, or Conciliar, and was simply one of many similar experiments made in America at the time.

Ultimate authority in the Protestant Episcopal Church, thus inaugurated and legally incorporated, was vested in the General Convention, in which laymen as well as clergy have place and part. By its Constitution and Canons, and by its Prayer Book adopted by General Convention, Bishops were recognized as ministers for Ordination and Confirmation, were empowered to act as executives in their dioceses for many purposes, and collectively they were to form an "upper house" in General Convention. The status of the Episcopal Church in the ecclesiastical world is perhaps best determined by the relation of its Episcopate to its General Convention.

Well-informed Churchmen have always disparaged the paper "Constitution," pointing out that the Church received its constitution at Pentecost; that it existed in all its parts prior to 1789; that the ministry on whom depended the validity of its sacraments was imported from England and Scotland; and that the rules adopted for these American dioceses represent no basis of principles, but are merely a scheme of local regulations. The so-called "Constitution" is, in the strict ecclesiastical sense, nothing but a collection of the more important Canons. General Convention is the creation of this Constitution, but not the episcopate. The latter was existent in America when the Constitution was

adopted, and the Bishops signed it. To be exact, the constitutional principle of the Church, that is, the perpetuation of the society sent into the world by our Lord, is to be found in what was inherited from England, not in what was newly devised in America. So far as government was concerned, the real constitution was in the Bishops, and the paper constitution only received authority from their approval. Strict Churchmen have usually taken some such view as this.

Others have maintained that ultimate authority rests with the multitude of believers; that all Episcopalians were created free and equal by baptism and pew-rent; that democratically exercising their sovereign power they created General Convention, which is supreme over all persons, clerical as well as lay; and that the episcopate has no powers except such as General Convention has conferred. The laity as a body are the sovereign people of God, the ministry their officers by election. Papal supremacy was superseded by royal supremacy, and this in turn by popular supremacy, all in accord with the processes of social evolution whereby feudalism made way for nationalism, which has realized itself in terms of democracy.

There is much to support both these views. The insistence on securing the episcopate from England and Scotland, the acceptance of the doctrine of the English Prayer Book, support the first view: the actual course of events in the Protestant Episcopal Church favors the second. The Bishops carefully maintain their right to sit as "a college of Catholic and Apostolic Bishops as such," yet confine themselves to discharge of their

duties as Upper House of General Convention. No one can fairly deny that the Episcopal Church has taken pains to assert the identity of its hierarchy with that of the early Church; yet it may be fairly questioned whether the assertion is substantiated by its actual workings. Assuming that the American Church inherited the ancient hierarchy from England, it is still necessary to consider the losses and gains of transit. It is necessary to answer not one question but two, Did it survive the Royal Supremacy of 1558? and Did it further survive the declaration of independence of this in 1789? The probable answer to both questions is No.

2. One aspect of the question of authority is determination of "the mind of the Church." Early Church history seems to show that the Church's mind was identified with that of the united episcopate. Both Latins and Greeks would agree to this, though the latter would hold that this mind only expresses itself through a General Council, while the former would look for its ultimate expression through the Papacy. Yet, in all parts of the Catholic Church; the episcopate would be regarded as constituting a college of doctors, representing the priesthood, through which it is in vital contact with the whole body of the faithful for which it functions as head. Easterns would emphasize the representative character of the episcopate in relation to the whole "people of God," but, no less than Westerns, would regard the Church as essentially hierarchical, and in the body of many members ascribe the functions of headship to those representing the group appointed

by our Lord as "first, Apostles." The Church is "the body of the baptized," but only this as "the Body of Christ." "We have the mind of Christ," more fully apprehended as the promised gift of the Holy Spirit gradually guides the apostolic body into all truth. The Catholic regard for the mind of the united episcopate, no matter what the special theory as to its method of functioning, is the antithesis of every form of individualistic or anarchic theory which, suspicious of all headship, identifies mind with individual will, assumes the impossibility of absolute truth, and at best conceives of the mind of the body politic or ecclesiastical as something diffused through the toes. The Catholic theory begins with unity, not with units, regards the mind of Christ as the shining of one light rather than myriad reflections from manifold facets, and derives all things by devolution from the Divine unity instead of seeing development only in coalescence out of primal diversity.

This principle is not illustrated in the history of the modern Church of England. This "Episcopal" Church has not in fact been guided by the mind of its episcopate. Although among its Bishops have been its strongest men, who, in the revived Convocation and in Lambeth Conferences, have during the last half century given many weighty expressions of opinion, yet the obvious limitations under which Anglican Bishops act would differentiate the authority of their pronouncements from that of episcopal synods elsewhere. In most important matters the judgment of the episcopate has been ignored. The first Prayer Book, prepared

by Cranmer and a subservient committee, had not the formal sanction of Convocation; the Elizabethan Prayer Book was repudiated by fifteen out of sixteen diocesans then in office and unwillingly acquiesced in by the sixteenth, Kitchin of Llandaff. The Prayer Books were devised under the auspices, and imposed by authority of, the secular authority. The Henrician and Marian Bishops, consecrated under the old pontifical, were the last in England to register episcopal judgments independently of Crown and Parliament; they stood for the Old Religion, although favorable to the New Learning as represented by Erasmus, Colet, and More. Edwardine and Elizabethan history show the deliberate suppression of episcopal opinion, and the appointment under the new Ordinal only of men who could be counted on to carry out the ecclesiastical policies of the Crown. There was a change of critical importance in England when older conceptions of the mind of the Church gave place to the coercive minds of Privy Councils.

The mind of the Anglican Churches is probably to be looked for in their official formularies. Although in the first instance these represented the opinions of a select few, and were imposed on the Church by the civil authority, yet in the use of them there has been general acquiescence, and one of the best definitions of Anglicans is "Prayer Book Christians." Eventually the Prayer Book was accepted as authoritative exposition of the Church's mind, and it may be so regarded now. This is in line with the Protestant tendency to supersede Catholic belief in the infallibility of the Church by be-

lief in the infallibility of certain literary documents, the Bible first, and then sundry "Books," "Confessions," "Covenants," and "Constitutions" of the sixteenth and subsequent centuries as authoritative interpretations of Biblical doctrine and legislation. In England this has meant deference to Acts of Parliament with the consequence that the actual doctors of the Church have not been its Bishops in synod but lawyers in the Court of Arches. This has important bearings on "continuity."

The mind of the Prayer Book, like that of the Articles, is on many important subjects a non-committal mind, a combination of contrasting hints that keep one guessing. The teaching of the English Church as to Baptismal Regeneration was defined by the Gorham Judgment of 1850, rejected by Catholic-Anglicans as the pronouncement of an incompetent tribunal, but only too consistent an exercise of Royal Supremacy and demonstration that Anglican teaching on the subject of Baptism is intentionally vague. Its substance is that, by the existing rule of doctrine, it could not be asserted either that infants are regenerated by Baptism or that they are not; the clergy may believe and teach either the one thing or the other or both indifferently; or "as the perfection of liberty, the same clergyman could now at the font, in the words of the Baptismal service, declare his belief in the former doctrine, and in the pulpit proceed to enforce the latter." The Prayer Book expressly says that the baptized child "is regenerate"; but there is a practical context that indicates that this need not mean just what it says. The Church of Eng-

land acknowledges several Baptisms, for, or not for, the Remission of Sins, as one chooses.

3. There is similar uncertainty in regard to the Eucharist. Nothing has more direct bearing on the question of continuity than the answer to the question, "Is the English Communion the Mass?" Apart from all considerations of title, this must be considered. In this there was change of name; was there also change of thing? Continental Protestants avowedly abolished the Mass and the Priesthood; Protestant Anglicans maintain that this was done in England. Catholic Anglicans deny it; they believe that pre-Reformation and post-Reformation Eucharists in England are substantially identical, though in somewhat different forms; that the mediæval Mass was Holy Communion in Latin; that the modern Holy Communion is the Mass in English. This question is vital. Unless the English Communion Office is essentially identical with the Latin Mass and Greek Liturgy, no matter what differences in form, language, and proportionate emphasis of aspects, unless the English Rite enshrines and continues the Catholic Eucharist, there has been severance of the Church's vital chord. Eucharistic succession forms its line of life.

I have always believed that the Order of Holy Communion of the First Prayer Book of Edward VI, "commonly called the Mass," was in essentials identical with the Latin Rite. I know that this is doubtful, but, though feeling the force of the arguments against the contention, still hold to it as the more reasonable assumption, finding convincing proof in the fact that

Bishops of the type of Gardiner and Bonner, wholly opposed to revision as it was being carried out by Cranmer, found it possible to accept the First Book because of certain details which safeguarded essential points. Cranmer's full intentions were not in fact carried out in 1549. In 1552 they were. From the Second Book were carefully removed all the features which enabled the conservative Bishops to accept the First. I have always believed the Book of 1552 heretical; yet it was barely introduced before Edward died, and was superseded in 1558 by a revision from which certain of its most objectionable features were removed. It is the Elizabethan Book by which the Church of England must be judged. Believing that this approximated the First Book, I was convinced of the orthodox character of Anglican standards. I now see that the Elizabethan Book is virtually that of 1552, and that Elizabethan legislation and customs make it clear that there was no real reversion to the standards of 1549.

The test-points in regard to the Mass are its exhibition of the Presence and of the Sacrifice. Gardiner and his colleagues found evidence that the First Prayer Book taught both; if so, the Communion of 1549 was the Mass in English. From the later Books, the traditional doctrine of the Sacrifice had disappeared, that of the Presence was obscured.

Cranmer was sufficiently under Continental influences to wish to do away utterly with both ideas. His opposition was more radical than Luther's, who held the Sacrifice "a stinking abomination," but held to the Presence. Cranmer's views varied; but the fol-

lowing passage seems to represent his tendencies during the critical years of Edward's reign.

"What availeth it to take away beads, pardons, pilgrimages, and such like Popery, so long as two chief roots remain unpulled up? Whereof so long as they remain will spring again all former impediments of the Lord's harvest and corruption of His flock. The rest is but leaves and branches . . . but the very body of the tree, or rather the roots of the weeds, is the Popish doctrine of transubstantiation, of the Real Presence of Christ's Flesh and Blood in the Sacrament of the Altar (as they call it), and of the Sacrifice and Oblation of Christ made by the priest for the salvation of the quick and the dead. Which roots, if they be suffered in the Lord's vineyard, they will overspread the ground again with the old errors and superstitions." *

There seemed to be no doubt in the minds of the first generation of post-Reformation divines that the English Communion Office had removed all traces of the Sacrifice. Hooker can say casually, "seeing then that sacrifice is now no part of the Church ministry, how should the name of priesthood be thereunto rightly applied?" † Later divines, feeling the necessity of following "ancient doctors" in regarding the Eucharist as in some sense Sacrifice, were disposed to connect the sacrificial idea with almost everything in the Sacrament except the central act of offering to God the consecrated elements! No Anglican divines have clearly held

* Parker Society Publications. *Original Letters*, p. 266.
† *Eccles. Pol.*, Bk. V: lxxviii; 3.

the doctrine of the Sacrifice, as it is expressed in the Latin Mass and Greek Liturgy, until in recent years it has been upheld by the younger generation of men affected by the Oxford Movement; and none of these, though assuming it for the Prayer Book, would have felt that the English Rite more than hints its expression. It must probably be conceded that in the matter of the Sacrifice Cranmer had his way.

It is not so clear that he did in the matter of the Presence. There has never been a time when there have not been Anglican theologians to insist on the Real Presence, and to believe firmly that this and this only is the teaching of the Prayer Book. Two names only are sufficient to vindicate the place for this belief in the Anglican Communion, for England, Bishop Overall who is supposed to have written the part of the Catechism on Sacraments, and for America, Bishop Seabury. Though avoiding attempts to define the manner of the Presence, they have had firm faith as to the fact. Dr. Darwell Stone accurately summarizes the Anglican teaching:

"The Church of England . . . has abstained from imposing upon her members any more explicit belief than that those who communicate rightly receive, not some indefinite gift of grace, but the very Body and Blood of their crucified and risen Lord. In supposing that the Church of England of necessity taught the further truth that this marvellous presence of Christ results immediately from the consecration and exists apart from Communion, the Tractarians appear to have read into the formularies of the Church of England that teaching of the ancient Church with

which the minds of their leaders were imbued. . . . At the present time, whatever differences in detail and in inference may exist, and however differently certain terms may be defined, there is agreement among Eastern Christians, Roman Catholics, and the successors of the Tractarians in the Church of England as to the central part of the doctrine of the Eucharist." *

The Anglican Churches have always had many sons who held to belief in the Eucharistic Presence and found the Prayer Book luminous with the doctrine. Yet of many more this has not been true. In Eucharistic controversy, the point in England on which most stress has always been popularly laid is its denial of "Transubstantiation." To instructed theologians this means rejection of a special mode of trying to explain the Presence, not the Presence itself; but to most this has signified what it did to Cranmer in the letter just quoted, not reverent agnosticism, metaphysical fastidiousness, and theological accuracy, but repudiation of the Mass as a mystery and miracle. Transubstantiation to most Anglicans, as to Calvinists, means the actual change of bread into the Body of Christ, what Catholics mean by the Real Presence.† Although most Anglicans ad-

* Stone: *Holy Communion,* pp. 185 f.

† The sense in which I interpreted the denial of transubstantiation is given in *Outlines of Church History,* p. 105.

"Adopting a mediæval philosophical theory concerning the relation of 'substance' and 'accidents,' the doctrine of transubstantiation asserts that after the consecration in the Eucharist the outward elements are done away with, although their appearance remains; and that all that is present is the Body and Blood of Christ. To many the recognition of the

mitted a Real Presence, their explanations often seemed to make it mean something not present and not real.

"In doubtful points betwixt her differing friends,
When one for substance, one for sign, contends,
Their contradicting terms she strives to join;
Sign shall be substance, substance shall be sign.
A real presence all her sons allow;
And yet 'tis flat idolatry to bow,
Because the Godhead's there, they know not how.

. . . . . .

Then by the same acknowledgement we know
They take the sign and take the substance too.
The literal sense is hard to flesh and blood;
But nonsense never can be understood." *

As Englishmen came more and more to believe in the Mass as a superstition, it was more because of dislike

permanence of the 'accidents' of the bread and wine concealing the 'substance' of the Body and Blood of Christ is taken as recognition of the two parts of the Sacrament. They would say that the sacramental principle and truth is merely expressed in terms of mediæval metaphysics. But with others the insistence that the earthly elements cease to exist after consecration is due to an assumption that the Divine annihilates the human and earthly. It is this aspect of transubstantiation which the Article of the Church of England condemns when it says that 'it overthroweth the nature of a Sacrament.' This type of theory says that in the Eucharist is present the Divine and the Divine only. It ignores a great principle of theology, that the 'supernatural does not destroy the natural,' the principle of the Incarnation, and of the application of Christianity to the sanctifying of human character, in which we are 'forever bound to insist that the human character, in its most fundamental nature, is meant to be developed, not overthrown, by supernatural grace.'"

* Dryden: *Hind and Panther,* 410-429.

for the idea of Presence than for that of repeated Sacrifice. To them as to Continental Protestants "Transubstantiation" signified the presence of something supernatural as the result of priestly consecration. Those who went about smashing altars were not painfully sensitive metaphysicians; and there were few in the sixteenth century who would have had the academic audacity to identify the English Communion with the Latin Mass, the saying of which was declared by Elizabethan law to be a penal offence. Popular disbelief in continuity is not disproof of it; but in this case it would seem to accord with the facts as shown in the formularies. The clear line of teaching about the Eucharistic Sacrifice was snapped; the line of teaching about the Eucharistic Presence was hopelessly blurred. The English Communion was emphatically distinguished from the Latin Mass, and, in consequence, from the Greek Liturgy; yet not so clearly from the Protestant forms of Communion, except the most radical. It was intended to exclude Zwinglian conceptions, but has in fact not done so. The common assumption of the similarity between the English changes in the Mass and the German and Swiss is nearer the truth than the strained interpretations of scholarly divines, holding tenaciously to the Anglican profession of consistent "appeal to antiquity."

4. The English Reformation made important changes in regard to Penance. There was no longer teaching that Penance was a Sacrament; and confession ceased to be part of the Church's regular system of discipline. It was made clear that private confes-

sion was only exceptionally to be used, "medicine not food," and only medicine needed for serious disease. The Prayer Book, in the Office for Visitation of the Sick, suggested that one in perplexity might make a special confession of sins, and provided a sacramental form of Absolution (omitted from the American Book). The only confessions generally required were declarations of universal sinfulness, followed by general declarations of God's power and willingness to forgive the penitent. There have always been Anglicans who felt that the Visitation rubric and Absolution prove the retention of sacramental Penance; the majority, with a Protestant horror of the confessional, have held that the Church of England wholly abolished it. If the Church's mind as to Penance be sought in the Prayer Book, it must be said that on all ordinary occasions there is no recognition of it; in an exceptional case, it is, so far as words go, provided for. But a rubric giving permission for private confession by an invalid cannot train clergy as confessors. The Latin and Greek Communions, in which the clergy are *inter alia* specifically ordained to absolve, teach their people about the Sacrament of Penance—as, for example, in the Russian Catechism—train the clergy in Moral Theology, and carefully safeguard both clergy and penitents in the confessional.* There are at present a fair number of skilled confessors and an increasing number of habitual penitents in the Anglican churches; but they represent

* At a recent conference between Anglican and Greek theologians, the Greeks said that they would wish to have an Anglican declaration of belief in Penance as a Sacrament.

something connived at, rather than provided for, by the Church's formal authority and custom, and there is a degree of doubtfulness about a representative and official act, not officially provided for, but left to the individual agent's discretion or whim.

Defenders of Catholic continuity in the Church of England can at best establish a continuity by stepping-stones. This is often the only sort of historical continuity demonstrable, and is all that is needed where stones are of one sort, in one line, and plainly prove a solid bed of rock beneath the surface; which is not the case in the modern Church of England. There is a raised highway of Protestant tradition, if custom be taken as best interpreter of law; but also various lines of stepping-stones, affording possible detours from this for those who, choosing some special line, are agile enough to take long leaps and preserve their poise on small and slippery boulders. It is possible to pick one's way along several lines of Catholic stepping-stones; but these do not represent the Church's main base, something separated by wide clefts from the Church of England's base prior to the sixteenth century.

When did the Catholic Church of England cease to exist and a Protestant Church take its place? There is no moment when in theory this happened. The legal fiction that one Church of England passed through all the changes of the Tudor reigns was always maintained. Yet continuity of spiritual things cannot be determined by forms of parliamentary law. The Church of England as a legal entity did not cease to exist. Its character as a provincial extension of the Holy Catholic

Church did. The moment is determined by three things: (1) the abandonment of Catholic doctrine of Sacraments by adoption of a Prayer Book which partly denies and almost wholly obscures it; (2) the acceptance of the royal supremacy in a form which overthrows the ancient government of the Church, episcopal as well as papal; and (3) a matter not yet considered, radical change in the Ordinal. When actually did these things happen? Not later than 1559.

CHAPTER VIII

ANGLICAN ORDERS

THE case for the validity of Anglican Orders has seemed to me until very recently to be incontestable. The Catholic hierarchy of England saw fit to break off relations with the Apostolic See, and to supersede the Latin Pontifical by an English Ordinal. The purpose of the new Ordinal, stated in its Preface, was to perpetuate historic Orders; and the form used was sufficient to carry out this purpose. "That these Orders may be continued," "receive the Holy Ghost for the Office of a Priest (or Bishop) in the Church of God" seems to make a simple and obvious case. Like all who believe in Anglican Orders on Catholic principles, I concentrated attention on these two things; the statement of purpose in the Preface, and the sacramental formula used at the imposition of hands. No matter what the faults and limitations of the English hierarchy, the validity of ordinations by Catholic Bishops, intending to perpetuate Catholic Orders, and using a Catholic formula, could not be questioned. Brought up to believe that the Orders of the Episcopal Church were those of the ancient Catholic Church, as distinguished from newly-devised ministries of modern sects, the historical evidence, when I came to examine it, seemed conclusive. Cranmer and his contemporaries represented the mediæval hierarchy; they adopted an Ordinal suit-

able for transmission of the historic Orders, and used it for that purpose; their whole action implied belief in Apostolic Succession which, through them, was transmitted to English Bishops and Priests. Parker's consecration was indisputably regular in spite of the "Nag's Head fable"; and these Orders were transmitted to America by the care of Connecticut to secure them from Scotland, and of Pennsylvania, New York, and Virginia to secure them from Lambeth. Even if schismatical, the Orders were valid, as all Catholics, Eastern and Western, must recognize, if they really knew the facts. The "Episcopal Church" was *par excellence* the Church of the ancient hierarchy, which, as contrasted with the Papal Church, it preserved in its ancient dignity and freedom.

Immediately after my ordination in 1895, I spent some weeks in Rome, and was interested to learn that the subject of Anglican Orders was to be reinvestigated by order of Leo XIII. At the English Church in *Via Babuino*, I often saw Lord Halifax, who was in Rome to urge the reinvestigation. I hoped and expected that this must result in recognition of their validity and remove a bar to unity, and wished for it earnestly, not because I thought Anglican Orders at all doubtful or dependent on the Pope's recognition; but because I hoped that the Pope and the Roman Church would no longer keep themselves in the wrong by refusing to recognize Catholic principles and history. The Bull *Apostolicae Curae* was a bitter disappointment, not that it affected the Orders, but that it indicated that the Pope had missed a great opportunity, and was

perpetuating a partisan position which involved denials of obvious historical truth. When the *Response of the English Archbishops* to the Pope was published, I felt that Anglican Orders had received a final vindication; and that its author, the Bishop of Salisbury, conclusively proved that the Pope, by insisting on the essential importance of the *traditio instrumentorum*, had made a hopeless blunder, condemning Anglican Orders on a principle subversive of his own. Nor did I change this opinion until long after I had begun to question the Orders for myself. Not a great while ago I remember saying, "If Leo XIII had only set me to write his Bull for him, I could have made a stronger case." The point I should have tried to establish was that circumstances and context may show that an orthodox formula cannot be taken at face value. This I now know to have been the real point of *Apostolicae Curae!*

Difficulties about Orders were not suggested to me by reading Roman Catholic books. They arose from my experience as Bishop dealing with ordinands and clergy, and from fresh studies of Reformation history. On Holy Saturday, 1895, I witnessed the ordination of about forty priests in St. John Lateran, was much impressed by the beauty and instructiveness of the ceremonial, and wished that Anglicans had retained the full symbolism; but nothing suggested doubts as to the sufficiency of the Anglican Ordinal, or the practical usefulness of its comparative simplicity in our conditions. The first suggestion of unsatisfactoriness in the Ordinal came into my mind on Trinity Sunday, 1910, when I was myself ordaining a priest in the Old Swedes'

Church, Wilmington. As I had to read the long exhortation, composed by Bucer, describing the work of a priest, I appreciated its inadequacy. There was nothing not good as far as it goes; but it fell short of such a well-rounded description of priestly work and character as one would wish for a moment so solemn and supreme. For the first time I felt strongly that the Ordinal was unsatisfactory. I did not doubt its sufficiency; but I recognized limitations, and saw, I think, that it was pre-eminently a setting apart of *preachers*. My own thought of priesthood had always centred about stewardship of Sacraments, especially the offering of the Holy Eucharist; and it was with a feeling of shock that I recognized how, in the Ordinal, the reference to Sacraments is incidental and subordinate, all emphasis being placed on study of Scripture and preaching with characteristically Protestant disproportion. I did not think much of these things in 1910 or for some time after; but, from that time, I was scrutinizing the Ordinal and our system of training and using clergy, and seeing that things were not as satisfactory as I had hitherto assumed. My optimistic, confident attitude was gradually making way for one that was disappointed and critical.

Eventually my thought of Anglican Orders passed through four stages, ending in June 1919, with recognition of the necessity of abandonment: (1) that they were schismatical; (2) that they were futile to guarantee some of the purposes of Orders; (3) that they were dubious, and (4) for this reason, and because of breaks in Catholic continuity, invalid.

1. I have already given reasons for believing that the responsibility for Anglican separation from the rest of Christendom must be chiefly laid on Cranmer and Henry. Yet, in existing conditions in Christendom, one might feel that the state of schism is inevitable; that the Anglican schism could be defended on several grounds; and that, in any case, its Orders, even if schismatical, are quite valid. Novatian, Donatist, Armenian, and various other lines of Orders regarded as schismatical, are of unquestioned validity. Yet to perpetuate Anglican Orders was to perpetuate the Anglican schism, and to do this it was necessary to be convinced of essential superiority in this schismatical position. The Bishop of Zanzibar (Dr. Weston) has insisted strongly on the necessity of believing that the Church of one's allegiance affords a possible basis for the reunion of Christendom. This of course I strongly believed at the time of my consecration. But, probably first in 1912, although always seeing the good done by the Anglican movement, I began to question whether its work might not for the most part be done, and long before I had thoughts of having to abandon its communion, I questioned the usefulness of perpetuating it indefinitely in America. The concrete question for me was, "Is American Christianity benefited by preserving the distinctness of the Episcopal Church in Delaware?" I came to doubt this. I felt more and more that Delaware Catholics had best be in communion with the Roman Catholic Bishop, that Protestants would be better off in some sort of federation. Less and less did I feel that, either for Catholics or Protestants, had

the Episcopal Church any potential superiority to justify its perpetuation. The moment I was conscious of such thoughts, I saw that, apart from all question of their correctness, they suggested that I had no right to retain my official responsibility.

A similar illustration was afforded by thoughts about religious provision for the village of Bryant Pond, where I have spent summers for twenty years. Although I have held regular services at Birchmere for my household and any who chose to use them, I never wished to see an Episcopal Church in the village. I wished that there might be a chapel for the handful of Catholics; and also to see all the Protestants in the congregation of my friend the Reverend E. H. Stover, a Baptist and the only resident minister, whose pastoral work was most admirable. Yet I saw the incongruity of being a Bishop when I felt that the coming of the Episcopal Church to my summer-home would introduce unnecessary religious divisions, and when I was more and more questioning its usefulness in Delaware. Its social position was irreproachable, its usefulness varied; but its doctrinal and ecclesiastical status was uncertain.

"*September* 20, 1918.

"What am I set to do in Delaware?

"To extend and perpetuate the Protestant Episcopal Church.

"What is that?

"An excellent form of Protestantism, whose distinctive merit is the beauty and dignity of Prayer Book forms.

"Is it essentially superior to other forms of Protestantism?

"No: the record of Presbyterians, for example, for good works is full as good; the influence of Methodists and Baptists is much more extensive.

"Is Protestant federation a good thing?

"Yes.

"How can the Protestant Episcopal Church best further this?

"By abandoning its insistence on episcopal ordination and its pretence of priesthood.

"Does the Protestant Episcopal Church train Catholics?

"Yes.

"What does it give them?

"A precarious existence now, and probably none a few years hence.

"But what of the Oxford Movement?

"A spent wave. The outward signs of its influence are on the increase; but it has failed to counteract destructive rationalism in the Anglican Communion, which was its fundamental aim.

"What then is it to maintain the Protestant Episcopal Church in Delaware?

"To perpetuate an unnecessary schism. Hence I must go. Q.E.F."

2. Two of the chief purposes of Orders are the ensuring of loyal witness to the Faith, and faithful stewardship of Sacraments. In the Anglican churches neither of these seems to be assured.

Clergy are usually, though not invariably, trained to believe in the Creeds; but custom does not compel them to continue to believe in or to teach them. Doctrinal laxity is characteristic. Everything which illustrates the inclusiveness which tolerates every variation from,

and denial of, articles of the Faith, may be cited as evidence that Anglican Orders are futile to accomplish one chief purpose of the apostolic ministry.

It may be urged that so long as the Church is officially committed to the Creeds, its position is unaffected by any amount of actual laxity, which is to be regarded merely as exceptional failure to keep up to the standard. One of the chief lessons of modern religious history is that, for the defence and perpetuation of Christian truth, something more is needed than official declarations. There is nothing singular in the Anglican declarations of loyalty to the theology of the Creeds. All forms of "orthodox" Protestantism, that is, all except Socinians, have similar official declarations. Yet, in the whole Protestant world, there has been, and is, steady drift away from definite belief in the doctrine of the Incarnation.* Lutheranism is still in theory committed to the Augsburg Confession; but the number of "Confessional Lutherans" is very small, there are practically none left in Germany. The Evangelical Church of Germany, comprising Lutherans and Reformed, is in theory "orthodox"; in fact, it maintains an evaporated Christianity. All Calvinists are committed to the Westminster Confession or some similar standard of doctrine; the letter of these documents is notoriously regarded as dead, and Unitarianism has everywhere followed in Calvinism's wake. Over thirty

* Carlyle noted this. "Protestantism," he said, "has its face turned in the right direction," by which he meant that it tended to denial of revealed religion.

years ago Aubrey Moore wrote a paper noting this fact, of which the last quarter of a century has afforded sweeping illustration. It used to seem to me that Calvinism and Unitarianism were related as cause and effect owing to the fact that, though theoretically maintaining the doctrine of the Trinity so firmly that Calvin burned Servetus, the Calvinist conception of God is essentially that of the Old Testament Jehovah or the Mohammedan Allah, the embodiment of wrathful Power. The Son has place in its system of salvation as innocent victim on whom the Father can glut His vengeful anger, but none in its practical theology. This phenomenon, however, is not confined to the history of Calvinism, but is observable in every phase of Protestant development. All Protestantism is committed to "the Bible and the Bible only"; yet it is among Protestants that the authority of the Bible has become most obviously discredited, and its doctrines discarded. The old standards have never been ostensibly abandoned; but so long as interpretation and application of them have been left to individual private judgment, there has been no maintenance of the standards. Documentary "articles of faith," left to individual discretion, have not discharged the function of the Church as "the Pillar and Ground of Truth." The whole history of Protestantism shows the valuelessness of official declarations alone to maintain loyalty to the Faith; and the history of Anglicanism affords no exception. Its clergy are bound by ordination vows to uphold the faith of the Creeds; actually they do not do so. This practical failure of men in Orders suggests queries as to the Orders themselves.

The historic succession of clergy in the Catholic Church has always been witness to the Faith once delivered.

Similarly have the Orders seemed futile to ensure true apprehension and full use of Sacraments. As stewards of the mysteries of God, too many Anglican clergy are habitually "unjust." They are ready to bid men take their bills and write down forty-nine, forty-eight, any low figure they choose, to represent sacramental obligations and beliefs, so long as they will receive them into their houses. They are habitually nervous lest people believe too much, but not worried by their believing too little. In many congregations, it makes little obvious difference in the status of members whether they are communicants; and if they can be induced to come to confirmation and communion, they are permitted to do so with any views of these rites they choose to hold. It is all in accord with Elizabethan insistence on conformity without insistence on conviction, with Protestant reference of all things to individual preference. This is not the method of the Catholic Church, performing Divine functions, the nature of which the Church itself teaches, and with which its individual members identify themselves. Episcopalian clergy are almost forced to content themselves with vague teaching about Sacraments, if they will keep the peace, since there are usually parishioners ready and desirous to be "aggrieved" at definite sacramental doctrine; in so doing they follow authoritative precedent. In "Catholic parishes" teaching is clear enough; but the Church only tolerates their clergy as eccentricities, which can be suppressed by public opinion if they be-

come aggressive. The Anglican clergy as a body do not illustrate the function of the Catholic priesthood as official guardians of the honor of Sacraments; nor, as has already been noted, are the ancient presentations of these continued by the system they are set to administer. Young men, beginning work after ordination with highest ideals of their stewardship of the Sacraments, seem compelled against their wills, by the normal conditions of their ministry, gradually to relapse to a lower plane. I have seen much of this in following the careers of my Seminary pupils and in knowing the circumstances of my own clergy. Consideration of these practical failures of clergy of the Anglican succession does not touch directly the question of validity; it does, however, suggest that the succession is not as effective as others. This was the effect on myself.

The practical consequence was change in my attitude toward candidates for Orders. I was tempted to warn young men with Catholic ideals of the inevitable disappointments ahead of them: I stopped suggesting to boys and young men that they consider possible vocation to the ministry: a promising candidate for Orders abandoned his course, and I was glad of it! For those who came to see me I did what I could in the way of sympathy and advice; but for six years at least my attitude was spiritless and my conduct perfunctory. I was appealed to on various matters connected with theological education, and took no interest. I had ceased to expect any thorough training for Catholic priesthood, or that such training, if provided, could be rightly utilized. Similarly, for at least as long a time,

I would do nothing to induce clergy to take work in Delaware. I would do all I could to help vestries and men who wished to come to get in touch with each other, but avoided all action which would in any way have made me personally responsible.

Thoughts like these, in 1913 and much more in 1916, suggested the duty of resignation. I had then no thought of giving up Orders, but debated my right to continue Bishop of Delaware. I owed my diocese hard work and sincerity, which I gave: I felt I owed also enthusiasm, which had become impossible. I tried to ascribe the despondency to ill health and personal worries, but had in the end to admit that they had nothing to do with it. I ought to have given up long before I did. I acted on the principle, "While merely in doubt, stick to your work," and was wishing to keep my mind in suspense until the results of the War on the ecclesiastical world were evident, and until after the next Lambeth Conference, which I keenly wished to attend. I resolved to give up my post the moment doubt became disbelief. I may have been slow in seeing when the time had come. At any rate, the errors were those of overcautious delay, not of impulsive haste.

3. For some time I knew that, in all probability, the practical test of ability to retain my post would come in connection with ordinations. I looked to those in prospect as so many hurdles, and rather expected that I should come to one I could not surmount. I thought much of this during 1917 and 1918, and although in February and August of the latter year I held ordinations without scruple, I suspected they might be my

last. In September, 1918, it happened that I could ask the Bishop of Pennsylvania to ordain one of my candidates for me; and I was glad of an excuse not to act myself.

During the months that followed, while I was constantly thinking of the subject of Orders, I happened to see an article by one of our Bishops in which he urged acceptance of our Orders on the ground that "no special theory was attached" to them, making it possible to attach any special theory one chose. It was not a profound disquisition, but it led me to consider the whole theory of Orders, and especially to compare Anglican arguments as to their being of the *esse* or of the *bene esse* of the Church. I had never had doubts that the former represented the true Anglican view. They *are* essential: the Church of England carefully preserved them, and rigorously insists on them: that proves the Anglican position, no matter how much tolerance there is of vague views. I had always been contemptuous of the *bene esse* contention. The reinvestigation, with my eyes opened, as they had not been in the past, to the actual facts of Anglican history as the result of recent studies, forced me to admit that the defenders of the *bene esse* view, as typically Anglican, have the stronger case. I had to concede their interpretation of the Preface to the Ordinal to seem the more reasonable, and that on their side are the bulk of facts that afford practical tests. In effect these make the Anglican Churches say: "We have kept the ancient Orders, Bishop, Priest, and Deacon; we require episcopal ordination for those who minister in our own

churches: but we do not say that it is absolutely necessary, nor do we require those who submit to it to have any particular opinions concerning it. It is to be assumed that our Church has a mind; but on this subject she has no opinions to express." The official attitude of an Anglican Bishop conferring Holy Orders is therefore, "I perform this solemnity whereby you may be admitted to minister in our churches: but as to what it is in itself, or as to what you and others are to think of it, I have officially nothing to say. Though personally and privately I—and so may you—hold Orders to be a Sacrament, officially I must treat them as doubtfully sacramental, and merely urge them as non-committally harmless." I had never been able to treat this view respectfully. I was forced to concede that it seems to me the better-sustained, if not the only possible, view of Orders as perpetuated in the Anglican Communion.

Such a view excludes belief in Orders as a Sacrament. If Our Lord by His commission of the Apostles instituted a Sacrament whereby His Divine grace is transmitted to those called to minister in His Name, this tremendous fact cannot be treated with indifference. Indifference in such matters is denial. If the sacramental theory of Orders be true, their necessity and authoritative character cannot be ignored: to adopt an ambiguous attitude, to refrain from clear assertion, is in effect to deny their sacramental character.

Clearer recognition of this some months later was the definite reason of my renunciation of the ministry. Other reasons were becoming more and more plain to me; but this was the only one I felt I could then specify

in my letter of resignation addressed to the Presiding Bishop.

"To my mind Orders to which 'no special theory is attached' are Orders to which no special importance is attached. Orders of this description do have the theory attached that no special theory is necessary, which excludes the sacramental view. To the Orders of the Catholic Church the theory is always attached, or rather, in them the principle is inherent, that Orders is a Sacrament, perpetuating the Apostolate instituted by our Lord. If the 'no special theory' view be the more correct one, Anglican Orders are proven dubious, if not invalid through defect of intention. If so, I for one cannot perpetuate them, nor can I hold them."

I had been set to thinking of these matters by the article read early in October, and at the end of the month, while the matter was simmering in my mind, I attended a conference at the General Theological Seminary between the Metropolitan of Athens, attended by five or six Greek theologians, and eight or ten representatives of the Episcopal Church. The object of the conference was to discuss the possibility of Eastern-Orthodox recognition of Anglican Orders. The Metropolitan was willing to urge this whenever political conditions permit the holding of an Eastern-Orthodox synod: and he stated that what would most help matters would be official declarations that Anglicans regard Orders as a Sacrament; that the XXXIX Articles are not to be regarded as having a doctrinal character; also that, in case of Eastern recognition of

the Anglican Orders, it should be clear that Anglicans would recognize the authority of an episcopal synod in which Easterns and Anglicans should sit together, that is, the paramount authority of the united episcopate. The sacramental character of the formula in the Ordinal was recognized by the Greeks; and their reasonable attitude was, "If you ordain by a form that implies that Orders is a Sacrament, why aren't you willing officially to say so?" It was asked whether such a declaration might not be made by the House of Bishops or by General Convention. One of the American theologians, commented, "Of course, we could never expect General Convention to do that." I feared he was right, but felt that it threw grave doubts on the virtue of the Ordinal, if when it implied a Sacrament of the Church, the General Convention could not be counted on to take it seriously.

A number of the Americans urged that the Articles, adopted from motives of political expediency for sixteenth century difficulties in England, could not be taken as exposition of the Church's doctrine, which must be sought in the Prayer Book; and hence that the Articles might be ignored. I was in full agreement with their dislike of the Articles, not with the feeling that they could be set lightly aside. They have played too prominent a part to permit of this, and all too accurately represent the theological position of many of our people.

I left the conference delighted with the Greeks, strongly drawn to them, but with the feeling that the attitude of the Episcopal Church toward Orders and

the authority of episcopal synods was so doubtful, that there could be no recognition by the Easterns if the exact facts were known. A few weeks later I wrote about it to one of the lay-members of the conference:

"*November 29*, 1918.

"I want to know what you think of the specific questions raised by the Greeks at the conference in New York.

"(1) Does the Anglican Communion regard Orders as a Sacrament?

"(2) If the East recognized Anglican Orders and hence automatically the right of the Anglican Bishops to sit in a synod with them, would the Protestant Episcopal Church recognize and obey a quasi-ecumenical synod so constituted?

"(1) . . . The Prayer Book treats Orders as sacramental, even though it hesitates to say more than that it is 'a state of life allowed in Holy Scripture'! But there are various important things in the Prayer Book which are not to be taken to mean what they say. It is notorious that many Anglicans do not consider that there is an actual imparting of the Holy Ghost in ordination; and it is often necessary to interpret P.B. language by context and custom. Notwithstanding the language of the Prayer Book and the belief of eminent Anglican divines, it is not certain that belief in Orders as a Sacrament may be affirmed of the Anglican Churches. It is quite unlikely that General Convention would deliberately affirm Orders to be a Sacrament or in any sense go beyond the letter of 'Two only.'

"The Greeks are quite right to insist, 'If you have a sacramental formula in your Ordinal, and say individually that you believe Orders sacramental, why don't you say it in the most formal and explicit way?' And when we won't do it, they would be quite right in saying, 'No matter what

form your Ordinal prescribes, it is quite plain that you do not believe your Orders to be sacramental.'

"(2) The Greeks with their traditional belief in the episcopate as the source of life and authority in the Church, holding to belief in the authority of General Councils in which bishops alone sat, quite naturally would defer to a synod comprising all available bishops, and would expect any part of the Church in communion with them to do so.

"The Protestant Episcopal Church would not recognize conciliar authority in its own bishops, much less in a synod in which they would be outnumbered by Orientals.

"(Take yourself for example. You might recognize the authority of a pack of bishops all of whose wires you could pull; but the bosses of the Anglican Curia could not manage the Easterns, no matter how well-trained their own diocesans were to stand without hitching; and you would not let them jeopardize the prospects of Protestant federation!)

"My opinion is that the true answer to both questions is 'No,' although Orders is a Sacrament or not Orders, and the assumption of the Greeks about the authority of a general episcopal synod is the only one possible for those who accept the principles of the early Church. The inference to be drawn is not the unreasonableness of the Easterns but the flimsiness of the Anglican claim to adhere to primitive conceptions.

"I need not explain what I myself would think in the abstract. I think you can see that my beliefs in principle do not harmonize with my view of facts; but it is the latter I am concerned with. What I want to get at is what must be said of the principles of the *Church*. I don't care about individual opinions, my own as little as those of any one else."

There came a sudden revelation of how far these meditations on Orders had carried me, when early in Advent I received two requests to ordain for other Bishops. The Bishop of Pennsylvania asked me to act for him in ordaining a Pennsylvania deacon, actually at work in Delaware; and the Bishop of New York wished me to hold an ordination for him in Trinity Church. I could easily have arranged to accept both invitations and would ordinarily have been more than willing to do so. I saw that it was impossible and declined both, not giving the real reason, which was that I had to admit to myself that I no longer was certain that Anglican Orders were Catholic Orders, and hence could not in good faith confer them. I regretted that I had received them: I refused to transmit them.

I had not at this time come to think them absolutely invalid, although I was doubtful about it; yet I felt they represented a line of ecclesiastical development not worth perpetuating. I did not then think them condemned by involving separation from the Apostolic See, though I deplored this, and felt even more strongly the separation from the Eastern-Orthodox Churches. It seemed to me that they were essentially connected with a principle of schism; that they failed to protect the Faith and Sacraments; and that there was so much doubt as to the intention with which they were conferred, that no Catholic Communion could recognize them as satisfactory, even if technically valid as having been transmitted through an unbroken line of Bishops. It was not until later that I came to feel that the dubi-

ousness alone was sufficient proof that, even if Orders of a sort, they were not Catholic Orders.

I saw at once that the refusal to ordain indicated that the time to give up had come. I did not wish to stop then, but could not honestly go on with my work. I made an appointment for a conference with the Reverend Dr. Laird, President of the Delaware Standing Committee, for the purpose of determining how I might end my work with least inconvenience to the diocese; but before I could see him, I was called to Ohio by serious illness in my family, and I could not talk with Dr. Laird until the end of January, when I spent four days at his house. I told him that I must give up as soon as possible, and, without going into details, the general reasons. There could not be actual resignation before October, when the House of Bishops would be in session; and it seemed to both of us that it would be best in the diocese for me to attend to all routine work up to the time of the diocesan Convention in May. At that time I wished to announce my intention to the diocese and go to Maine. Until then, I wished nothing said, to avoid unnecessary discussions and explanations and the ordeal of formal farewells. The plan we made in January was carried out exactly except that I did not go to open the Convention. As the time for this approached, I could see that my absence would simplify matters in various ways, and I wished to avoid any public exhibition of my loss of faith. I asked the advice of Dr. Laird, Chancellor Curtis, and Mr. George R. Hoffecker, who after conference unanimously advised me not to be present at the Convention. This

helped me out of a difficulty, as there was illness in my family, and I was constantly needed at Birchmere. In the trying ordeal of leaving Delaware, the greatest comfort and support I had was the knowledge that Dr. Laird, who had no sympathy with my church views and did all he could to dissuade me from resignation, wholly credited the sincerity of my motives and believed that I had in every way considered the interests and convenience of the diocese. A few days before his death the following August he spoke of me in kinder terms than I deserve, expressing his "confidence that (I) would always act according to the dictates of (my) conscience." This I like to think of as the close of my connection with Delaware.

4. At the time of breaking from my diocese the only thing perfectly clear was the duty of resigning my post: I did not yet see what I must do about the Orders and Communion of the Episcopal Church. I knew that abandonment of both was even probable and told intimate friends so; but it was quite conceivable that it would seem my duty to end life "as an Anglican derelict." In the quiet of Birchmere, things began quickly to shape themselves. I had not been there a month before I saw plainly that my letter of resignation must be also a renunciation of the ministry, and in that form it was sent. I was also continuing my investigations of the Ordinal, and by July was convinced not only that Anglican clergy were prevented from discharging the normal duties of episcopate and priesthood by the overthrow of spiritual authority consequent on the establishment of Royal Supremacy and by changes in the

Prayer Book involving defective administration of Sacraments, but also that the Orders were initially invalid owing to changes in the Ordinal showing defect of Catholic intention. I had therefore come to adopt the Roman grounds for rejection of them, being led to see the case more clearly by the reading of a number of books by Catholic writers, especially some of the essays of Cardinal Gasquet.*

It was a great shock to me to learn that the specification of "the work of a Priest (or Bishop) in the Church of God" in the ordination formula was not inserted until 1662, and that this fact throws doubt on the sufficiency of the formula used previously: yet this sufficiency I still assume. Nevertheless the changes made in Cranmer's Ordinal of 1552, the companion of the heretical Second Prayer Book, in use after 1559, are of a sort which indicate that the words used must not be taken too literally. Just as "Seeing that this child is regenerate" may be, and often is, interpreted, "Seeing this child is not regenerate if you prefer to think so," and as "The Body of our Lord Jesus Christ which was given for thee" may mean to those who wish, "Not the Body of our Lord Jesus Christ, but bread to be eaten in remembrance," so "Receive the Holy Ghost (for the work of a Priest)" may mean no more than "Submit to imposition of hands implying no transmission of sacramental gifts, in order to secure a license as a Preacher."

The Ordinal of 1552 was a substitute and can only

* Especially the essays on *Anglican Ordinations* and *The Greek Ordinal in England under the Old Religion.*

be understood by comparison with what it superseded. The Sarum Pontifical, like all Catholic forms of ordination, Eastern as well as Western, created Mass-priests. The essential matter in ordination is the laying on of hands with prayer; the context of this, word, and ceremonial, constitute the form showing with what special intention and significance hands are imposed. Priests are set apart to "offer," to absolve, to bless, to preach, and to rule; but the special function emphasized by the ritual of ordination is the power to offer the unbloody sacrifice of the Mass. The special characteristic of priesthood is sacrifice. Other functions are not forgotten. The ministry of the Word as well as Sacraments was indicated in the Sarum Pontifical; there was symbolical tradition of the Bible to Bishops as well as of the Chalice and Paten to Priests: but the dominating and central thought of Catholic Ordinals is that the special function of the Christian priesthood is the offering of the Eucharistic Sacrifice.

From Cranmer's Ordinal of 1552, as from his Prayer Book of the same date, every reference to the Eucharistic Sacrifice was expunged: there was no specific reference to the Eucharist, nothing but the vague "and Sacraments." He retained everything that related to the ministry of the Word, and enlarged on this, defining the duties of the ministry as consisting of the study and preaching of Scripture and the cultivation of domestic virtues. He commissioned not Mass-priests but married preachers.

An excellent illustration of this is to be found in the change made in the exhortation to ordinands. In the

old Pontifical the special point is thus expressed: "To celebrate Mass and consecrate the Body and Blood of Christ; . . . that they may know that in this Sacrament they receive the grace of consecrating . . . and may acknowledge that they have received the power of offering pleasing sacrifices, since to them pertains the office of consecrating the Sacrament of Our Lord's Body and Blood upon the altar of God. . . . In this appears the excellency of the priestly office, by which the Passion of Christ is daily celebrated upon the altar." Cranmer left nothing of this sort. Its place was taken by the homily of Bucer. "Seeing that ye cannot by any other means compass the doing of so weighty a work, pertaining to the salvation of man, but with doctrine and exhortation taken out of the holy Scriptures, and with a life agreeable to the same; consider how studious ye ought to be in reading and learning the Scriptures, and in framing the manners both of yourselves and of them that specially pertain unto you, according to the rule of the same Scriptures; and for this self-same cause, how ye ought to forsake and set aside (as much as you may) all worldly cares and studies." And much more to the same effect.

Cranmer's determination to abolish the Sacrifice of the Mass was clearly expressed in 1552; a characteristic utterance has been already quoted. It was generally assumed and stated under Elizabeth that the English clergy were no "Mass-priests." The opinion of the more conservative theologians would be represented by Hooker.

"Seeing then that sacrifice is now no part of the Church ministry, how should the name of priesthood be thereunto rightly applied? . . . The Fathers of the Church . . . call usually the ministry of the Gospel priesthood in regard of that which the Gospel hath proportionable to ancient sacrifices, namely, the communion of the Blessed Body and Blood of Christ, although it have properly now no sacrifice. As for the people, when they hear the name, it draweth no more their minds to any cogitation of sacrifice than the name of a senator or an alderman causeth them to think of old age." *

Instructed Anglicans always recognize some sort of Eucharistic Sacrifice, and emphasize the "sacrifice of ourselves" and the "sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving" as well as the commemoration of the "Sacrifice once offered"; but with the Prayer Book as it is, they must avoid the identification of sacrifice with the acts of oblation and consecration of the bread and wine, the main point of the traditional doctrine. Much as many of them would wish to do so, they are tied to Cranmer's omissions.†

To those who believe in Mass-priests, the determination of the relation of the English Ordinal to these is decisive. The questions, Did the Prayer Book continue the Mass? and Did the Ordinal continue the Priesthood? go together. To all, whether or not they believe in the

* *Ecclesiastical Polity,* Book V, Chap. lxxviii, Sec. 3.

† For characteristic statements, see Wordsworth in *Responsio Archiepiscoporum Angliae ad Litteras Apostolicas Leonis Papae XIII de Ordinationibus,* Sec. XI, and Gore, *Body of Christ,* pp. 210-214 and 236 ff.

Mass and the Priesthood as its correlative, it must be quite clear that, if Cranmer did alter the Ordinal in this respect, there was no truth in the claim that the old Orders had been continued, and that his formation of a new ministry was as radical a breach with the past as the corresponding acts of Luther and Calvin. There is no irresistible magic in the imposition of episcopal hands.

When an Anglican priest is ordained, he may be, and usually is, commissioned by use of the words "Whosesoever sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them; and whosesoever sins ye retain, they are retained," taken over with the old form of conferring jurisdiction, in the new Ordinal made central in the rite. This ought to seem sufficient guarantee of a grant of power of Absolution, and is so considered by most. Yet the commentary of custom detracts from the natural meaning. This practically reduces it to, "If you think this commissions you to hear sacramental confessions, you may hear them as a permissible extra; as to knowledge of spiritual medicine and surgery, you are left to your own devices." Examination of the canons of Moral Theology suggest that there is something doubtful about a commission which in practice is taken to mean so little or so much, and often to mean nothing at all. Doubt about the Church's doctrine of Confession and Absolution throws analogous doubt on the commission to remit and retain sins.* Doubtful doctrines of the Eucharist and Penance imply doubtful Orders; and

* See account of Round Table Conference at Fulham.

doubtful Orders are not such as are conferred by the Catholic Church.

Another important change was in the form of oath required of Bishops at consecration. Before the Reformation, a Bishop at consecration made two formal professions, a confession of faith, and an oath of allegiance to the Pope as head of the Church: he was to be witness to the Incarnation, and was to be united with the Catholic episcopate, inheriting the authority of the Apostles. From Cranmer's Ordinal these were omitted, and in place was substituted an oath of allegiance to the King as the Church's Supreme Head. The new Bishops were primarily royal henchmen. In America is substituted an oath of allegiance to the Doctrine, Discipline, and Worship of the Protestant Episcopal Church, in effect a pledge of loyalty to the General Convention. This blurs at least the ancient conception of the episcopate, not only in regard to the recognition of the spiritual, rather than the temporal, power as supreme, but also in regard to the witness to the faith. English Bishops take oath of allegiance to the Archbishop, Archbishops to the King only. The breach of continuity in the conception of ecclesiastical authority was thus reflected in the Ordinal.

There is also bearing on the estimation in which the Ordinal is held in the prevailing tendency to favor "Open Pulpit." The dominant idea of the Anglican Ordinal is the sacrosanct character of preaching. Priests receive the Holy Ghost chiefly for the ministry of the Word, symbolized by the tradition of the Bible. Ordained priests only have full right to preach; and

this is emphasized as their characteristic function. The first duty impressed on newly-baptized infants is "to hear sermons." Deacons receive authority to "read the Gospel in the Church of God," but only "to preach the same if thereto licensed by the Bishop himself." There is to be no preaching by any one unordained; the laying on of episcopal hands is required for admission to the pulpit. There is not this emphasis on preaching in Catholic Ordinals, though it corresponds to Protestant forms of commissioning a "Gospel-ministry." This strict hedging of the pulpit is reinforced by prescription of canons; there is no similar emphasis on hedging of the Altar. Those who take the Ordinal as providing for Open Pulpit but Closed Altar ignore its actual character.

The idea, however, that preaching must be restricted to a solemnly consecrated priesthood is well-nigh obsolete. Deacons are keen to hold forth, in and out of season, with or without the Bishop's license; lay-readers, especially if they be seminary students instigated by courses in Homiletics, become itinerant Chrysostoms, often "exchanging pulpits," and flooding their missions with torrents of eloquence which fortunately dry up when once they are ordained: many congregations clamor for lay-speakers, on ordinary as well as special occasions, and care little for the opinions of Liddon or St. Thomas Aquinas on abstruse doctrinal points, if they can have general disparagement of all such things in a "red-blooded talk" by some eminent corporation lawyer! Never was the narrowness of "clerical bigotry" more at a discount in public speech

as contrasted with the untethered freedom of the "honest layman." I once heard the Vicar of St. Barnabas', Oxford, contrast the Church's theory of Orders with the notion that "all that is needed to make a preacher is a gift of gab and a white tie." We now dispense with the white tie! "Freedom of prophesying" is interpreted to mean, not only, that all shall be equally free to express their opinions on religious subjects, but also, that those least to be trusted are the class of men who have been solemnly commissioned to do so! This demand for "Open Pulpit" proves absence of belief in the necessity of a special gift of the Holy Ghost for preachers, and of belief that the priests of the Anglican Ordinal receive one. Context of custom as well as literary context may show that solemn words are used without power to mean, even if with intention to mean, all that, literally understood, they express. The spirit killeth when the letter would give life. The real regard of many for the significance of Ordination would not be greater than that expressed by Cranmer, author of the Ordinal in 1540, in answer to an inquiry made by Henry VIII.

"The ministers of God's Word under his Majesty be the Bishops, Parsons, Vicars, and other such priests as be appointed by his Highness to that ministration . . . be appointed, assigned, and elected, and in every place, by the laws and orders of Kings and Princes. In the admission of many of these officers be divers comely ceremonies and solemnities used, which be not of necessity, but only for a good order and seemly fashion; for if such offices and ministrations were committed without such solemnity, they were

nevertheless truly committed. And there is no more promise of God that grace is given in the committing of ecclesiastical office, than it is in the committing of civil office."

This opinion of Cranmer's has no final authority; yet there is much corroboration of it in many facts that make the word of the Ordinal of none effect through persistent Anglican tradition.

In attaching so great importance to belief in Orders as a Sacrament that it proved to be decisive in making one of the most critical decisions of my life, I have merely followed and practically applied a line of thought emphasized for years. In 1910 I read before a clerical gathering in Brooklyn a paper on *The Principle of Orders*,* in which I sought to indicate the relation of this to the doctrine of the Incarnation.

"Our attitude toward the Principle of Orders, and toward the relation of Orders to Unity . . . is one on which indifference is no longer possible. We must believe less than we have concerning our ministry, or we must believe more: and in either case we must know what we believe, and why we believe it. Moreover, having clear convictions, we are bound to maintain them; because either way they have bearings of immense practical importance upon crying needs of our time. . . .

"The immediate future is likely to demonstrate in what direction our own Church is moving; and that move one way or the other it must. It occupies a middle position in Christendom, and hopes to use this position to mediate for unity. In our desire to show 'malice toward none and charity for all,' we have been loth to emphasize differences.

* Published in *Principles of Anglicanism.*

We have gloried in our duality to the verge of duplicity; we have halted between two opinions, and have shown unmistakable symptoms of the ailment of Laodicæa. Yet we must declare ourselves plainly, if we be challenged to choose between the old and a new not akin to the old. A choice not only of critical, but of vital, importance lies before us in the consideration of what we believe, what we maintain, and what we abandon, in our theories of the Christian ministry; for belief about Orders involves belief about Sacraments; and belief about Sacraments, belief about the Church; and that belief resolves itself into the answer we give to the one decisive, discriminating question of questions: 'What think ye of Christ? Whose Son is He?'" *

* *Principles of Anglicanism,* pp. 103, 123 f.

CHAPTER IX

PREJUDICE AGAINST ROMANISM

" *Chamberlain.* I left him private,
Full of sad thoughts and troubles.
Norfolk. What's the cause?
Cham. It seems the marriage with his brother's wife
Has crept too near his conscience.
Nor. No, his conscience
Has crept too near another lady."

The reasons given for abandoning work and Orders have not been directly connected with Roman Catholic claims. They have related quite as much to separation from the Greek as from the Latin Communion: it was in fact consideration of the relations between Easterns and Anglicans which precipitated the decision. At the time of sending a letter of resignation to the Presiding Bishop, I was uncertain whether for a number of reasons I ought not to die in the Communion in which I had been reared, although I could no longer work for its perpetuation. Nevertheless for three years I had been drawn strongly to the Roman Communion, as a few intimate friends knew; and for some time when they had been saying, as I had always said myself, " Anglicanism may be difficult; but Rome is impossible," I had said, " It is Anglicanism which seems impossible; and Rome, though difficult, seems inevitable." So strong had been the Romeward drift, that I consulted one of

the Bishops, who knew all the facts, as to whether I was uncandid not to speak of this in my formal letter of resignation, which I had not done, thinking that the Bishops were concerned not with possibilities but with facts: and, in personal letters to the Presiding Bishop and other Bishops, I told what I thought would ultimately happen, offering to hasten the decision if it would simplify matters in dealing with my case, and giving full permission to make the fact known if they saw fit. Nevertheless it was not until August, 1919, that I saw that I could make my submission *ex animo*, although I postponed action in order that my resignation might be first accepted, that there might be no appearance of haste, and that I might first prepare a full statement of reasons for the decision.

The de-Anglicanizing and the Romanizing processes overlapped for three years; but they were distinct, and even independent, except that each doubtless accelerated the other. Had there been no apparent alternative, I should probably not have been able to give up my old faith. While I recall clearly enough the successive stages in my mental processes, I find that memory cannot be trusted as to exact dates. To determine these, I am as dependent on written and printed records of opinions as if I were dealing with the history of another person. The evidence of my letters is surprising. Strong expressions of disaffection with Anglicanism, and of recognition of the power in Roman Catholicism, occur at dates earlier than I remember or should have thought likely; and recent letters show hesitation on certain points which, if I trusted my memory only,

I should have thought settled long since. It is quite clear, however, that my anti-Roman prejudices existed in almost full force in 1915, and that there was rapid and definite Romanizing afterward.

The account given of antecedents and early training has shown that I belonged to a world in which the Roman Church seemed to be a negligible factor. I recall no bitterness against it in the people I knew: but it was assumed to be outside the purview and experience of Americans like ourselves. Only one friend of my family was a Roman Catholic, Mrs. Edward Jones of Cleveland, a grand-niece of Fenimore Cooper. She was, by common consent of her friends, the best, as well as cleverest, woman in the circle in which she moved: but, though her friends could not but respect a faith which made her what she was, they thought it strange that she should be a Catholic, and when a Club of ladies of which she was president attended her Requiem Mass, they thought it beautiful, but not at all of their world. As a boy in my late teens I had great admiration for Mrs. Jones: and I remember that once she referred to her Church, of which she seldom spoke, in a way that assumed that I would understand it. I do not remember at all what the remark was; but it suggested the thought in a way I never forgot, "What if some day I too should become a Roman Catholic." There was no deep impression: but it has never been possible for me to have any great dread of a faith deliberately adopted by one whom I so much admired as I did Mrs. Edward Jones.

I was sixteen or seventeen when I first saw the inside

of a Roman Catholic church. My mother wished to go to Mass out of curiosity and took me with her to the Cathedral in Cleveland. I only recall vaguely that it did not seem to me so impressive as services at St. Paul's School, because it was unintelligible: but two things I never forgot. One was the rapt expression of a young man who made his Communion, and the other was the peroration of the sermon. Of all the sermons I heard during my youth, this is the only one of which exact words stick in my memory. They were: "If any one says that the parochial schools are not as good as the public schools, he is a calumniator; and he is an ass to calumniate." I much preferred the style of Dr. Coit, and concluded that Roman Catholic preaching was decidedly inferior to Episcopalian. These slight incidents comprise the whole of my contact with Roman Catholics during boyhood.

There was little more in subsequent years. In January, 1892, just after my first term in Oxford, I was in London at the time of the death of Cardinal Manning, and out of curiosity went to the lying-in-state at the Archbishop's Residence in Westminster. There I had a strange experience of which I have never spoken to any one but my sister, which suggested the thought that I might, or even ought, some day to become a Roman Catholic, in so forcible a way, that the memory was indelible, though there was no practical consequence of any sort. At that time I was making it my business to learn all I could of the Church of England, and to breathe her atmosphere. I was gaining great enthusiasm for all she stood for, and while always respect-

ful toward the great Roman Communion, was learning clearly the reasons for not accepting Roman claims. I never entered any Roman church in England except once or twice to stroll into the Brompton Oratory.

In 1895, just after ordination to the diaconate in Paris, I spent the last four weeks of Lent in Italy. There I had glimpses of the life, as well as of the painting and architecture, in churches of Venice and Florence, and made it my business to observe what I could of things Roman in Rome. I made my Communions regularly at the English and American churches, but tried to keep a Roman Holy Week and Easter. I went regularly to the churches of the Station for the day, was at St. Peter's on Palm Sunday, for *Tenebrae* on Wednesday, and for Easter when Cardinal Rampolla celebrated at High Mass; visited no fewer than twenty-five churches on Maundy Thursday; the *Scala Santa* and Santa Croce-in-Jerusalem on Good Friday; and St. John Lateran on Holy Saturday for services lasting from six until two, the striking of the fire from flint for the Paschal candle, baptisms of heretics, and ordinations to all minor Orders and of about forty priests. I was determined to join devoutly in all I could, but expected to encounter obstacles at which my devotion would have to be held abruptly in check. To my amazement I discovered little to evoke my vigilant Protestantism. In the *Confiteor* I balked at confession to the Saints, but as it went on *et vobis fratres* (*et tibi pater*), it occurred to me that there was no intentional idolatry, and that it was simply equivalent to "in the sight of the whole company of Heaven," with which I was famil-

iar in the Confession at Compline used in Oxford and Shepton! So of various other things. There was little to disturb my delight in the ancient Offices as well as I could follow them, although I looked askance at notices of indulgences and exposition of relics of doubtful authenticity. On the whole, I was agreeably disappointed at not finding things Roman as superstitious as I had expected, although I felt the Holy Week observances to be inferior to Anglican in confusing the strict sequence of events.* Nothing marred my Anglican complacency. I ascribed the absence of deplorable modern superstitions in the great basilicas to the fact that ancient traditions were kept by force of local association, as in Milan by the potent memory of St. Ambrose; yet I did not doubt their existence in ordinary churches. Idolatrous cult of saints was what I expected to find. Yet in the great churches I felt much at home and felt that they measured up fairly well to the standards of the Oxford Movement! I came away from Rome feeling that after all Rome was not wholly bad, and convinced that Roman Catholicism was best for Italians, Spaniards, and French. The little experience was helpful later in giving better appreciation of much that I read, and in strengthening my wish to be fair and sympathetic toward Roman Catholi-

* E.g. my organ of exact chronology was irritated by anticipation of Easter at *Tenebrae* on Wednesday, although the shuffling of the feet for the earthquake and appearance of the candle from behind the altar appealed to me as dramatic symbolism: the "sepulchres" for the Reserved Sacrament on Maundy Thursday seemed to carry one on to Saturday; and Good Friday seemed to be depressed between two festivals.

cism and to mitigate the sharpness of Protestant prejudice. Yet I had strong anti-Roman convictions chiefly on historical grounds.

For ten years after this, I had no contact with Roman Catholicism, knowing few Catholics and them very slightly, and never entering one of their churches except once on a vacation when no Episcopal church was accessible. I was reading much, becoming somewhat better informed on some matters of Roman controversy, modifying my views of papal history in such a degree as would be represented by the difference between Milman and Creighton (or Ranke and Pastor): I read much of the Council of Trent, feeling that the racy details of Fra Paolo Sarpi did not essentially alter the substantial accuracy of the edifying journal of Pallavicini: I took up the study of the Vatican Council, expecting to learn of many scandals from Janus and Mr. Gladstone, but ended with the feeling that it was not so bad after all, and that the actual carefully-guarded dogma afforded no difficulty to those who believed in the Papacy. I saw plainly that if one accepted the Papacy as integral to the Church, infallibility, as defined, followed as simple and obvious consequence. I was also beginning to have great admiration for Leo XIII, although I did not study his Encyclicals as carefully as I did later.

On the whole, I was somewhat less ignorant of Roman Catholicism when I went abroad for the summer of 1905. The chief object of this trip, however, was to learn something at first-hand of the Greek Church, partly to stimulate my special interest in everything

Eastern-Orthodox, partly to strengthen my belief, frequently expressed in lectures, that the existence and history of the Eastern Churches was the great disproof of Roman contentions. I felt strongly that Constantinople was the chief outer defence of Canterbury; that the Russian Church afforded one of the chief bulwarks of the Anglican: that England and America were best defended from Roman aggression by strategic war in the Balkans.

Yet on this trip I had a striking illustration of the way in which forcible impressions come where and when least expected. On June 29, I spent the day in Kadi-Keui (Chalcedon), carefully looking up all remains of the days of the Fourth Council, having previously discovered the Chalcedonian marbles in the Suleimanieh Mosque in Constantinople and inspected the mummy of St. Euphemia, patron-saint of the Church of the Council, in the Patriarcheion. At the new Cathedral in Kadi-Keui I had a pleasant experience. A Greek priest who was showing me about, asked through the dragoman whether I was "Catholic or Protestant." On my replying "Anglican," he said, "Oh, then we are great friends; come home with me for coffee." This was a little thing, but seemed significant proof of Eastern backing of the Anglican position.* Perhaps there never would have been a moment when I would

*I met no priests in Constantinople. I had a letter of introduction to the Patriarch from the Archimandrite Teknopoulos of London, with whom I had been in correspondence for several years, but had not presented it, having no suitable raiment with me for calling on patriarchs.

have felt more the futility of Roman pretensions. Yet on leaving the Greek church and the friendly priest, I went to look in at the great Franciscan church close by, entering during the High Mass for the festival of St. Peter and St. Paul. There seemed to me something specially impudent in setting up this Latin church in Chalcedon with its memories of Canon XXVIII, and I was not predisposed to be favorably impressed. Yet I knew at once that there was something more *alive* in this Latin church than in any of the many Greek churches which I had been haunting during the preceding fortnight. I had to admit to myself afterwards that of all I saw in the East, the one place which seemed instinct with missionary vitality was the one seat of Romanism I entered there: and I have never been able to shake off the impression made by that Franciscan church at Kadi-Keui, although I came home to lecture with more enthusiasm of the Eastern Church, and to emphasize more than ever the supposed confutation of Petrine assumption by the Chalcedonian assertion, "The fathers gave prerogatives of honor to the Bishop of the Elder Rome, because it was the Imperial City."

Later in the summer, I spent ten days in Rome, paying special attention to mediæval associations, storing up memories for subsequent rumination, though less interested than I had been in Greece and Asia Minor. I also visited various German and Austrian churches, being especially impressed by services in St. Stephen's, Vienna, and in the churches of Cologne. There seemed to be a hearty evangelical tone which I ascribed to the indirect influence of Luther! On this trip, I was mak-

ing a special study of the development of the cult of Our Lady as it appears in art. In early mosaics and paintings, Our Lord is always central and dominating, the Blessed Virgin at one side and subordinate: in later ones the size of her figure and her position approximate His, until they are equal as in the Coronation in Santa Maria Maggiore: later still hers is the larger central figure, the Madonna enthroned, and His, the Child, though with the Divine halo, subordinate. I was disposed to see in this a dangerous tendency in "modern Rome." In some twenty of the Roman churches too I examined indulgenced prayers, finding many addressed to saints for direct blessings with no suggestion of comprecation. I remember especially one addressed to St. Gregory imploring him to convert Anglicans. The experiences of this summer dissipated some prejudices and confirmed others.

On the voyage homeward, I shared a state-room with two priests, a Belgian Capucin and a German Carmelite; and with the former I became great friends. I talked with him of many things, among others of my liking what I saw in German churches better than much that I had seen in Italian. I spoke apologetically fearing to offend him, at which he seemed surprised. "Don't you know," he asked, "that every northerner feels that way? Did you ever hear that St. Alphonsus Liguori wished missionaries to convert the heathen in the Papal States?" In various ways he intimated that, among the staunchest believers in Roman Catholic principles, there was free criticism of many practical applications of them, tending to disabuse me of the notion

that among Roman Catholics all discussion and criticism are stifled, and nothing permitted but blind submission to authority. I recall few details of the conversations with him; but it was my first experience of the varied delights and surprises of intercourse with a well-educated priest; and I was much influenced by him in several ways, although I cannot clearly trace the manner of it.

During my life in New York, I had no contact with Roman Catholics, although constantly in touch with Eastern-Orthodox, chiefly the clergy of the Russian Cathedral and M. Lodygensky, the Russian Consul-General. But I was reading many books by Catholic writers, especially French historians, making much use of Duchesne and Batiffol: and it was a hobby of mine that we had much more to learn from Catholic writers than from rationalizing Germans, whose authority was slavishly followed by many in America and England. I delivered several lectures each year on religion in modern Germany, the chief points of which were that the rationalizing process inaugurated by Luther, essentially antagonistic to the supernatural, had actually led to scepticism and paganism in Germany; but that the tide had turned and "criticism" was proclaiming as new discoveries various matters of traditional belief in the Church; that the only way to understand Ritschl and Harnack was in terms of Strauss and Baur; also that the disintegration of German Protestantism had resulted in exhibiting Roman Catholicism as the one great religious power in the various German States. So far as books went, I was as much influenced by

French writers as by any, read Loisy without assent, and wholly approved Pius X's discernment of the character and tendency of Modernism and his unhesitating condemnation of it. I greatly deplored the influence of German " scholarship " in Oxford, and was in sympathy with criticisms of the lack of authority in the English Church, which I happened to see in the *Tablet*.

After going to Delaware, I thought little of Roman Catholicism except to deplore the fact that being " Roman," it could not *ipso facto* be really Catholic, and hence not, in the most effective way, American. My great objection to it was that as " Roman," rigidly forced into an Italian mould, and dominated by an Italian oligarchy, it could not represent Catholicism in the best form for American people, no matter how effective it might be for those living in Mediterranean countries. I believed Anglicanism to be the best Catholicism for English-speaking peoples. I had heard that American Roman Catholics had an independent stamp of their own, not wholly appreciated in the Curia; and I believed they had many excellences due to their special environment: but I could not think of them as best equipped to teach religion to Americans, except to those newly arrived from Roman Catholic countries. I doubted whether Roman Catholics could be the best-trained Americans, although wholly out of sympathy with a tendency to exclude them from the highest political offices, and wholly in sympathy with their wish to train their children in their own schools. While not believing their teaching the best possible, I thought they set the rest of us a good example in their

insistence on the necessity of religious training. I was in sympathy with much of their criticism of the religious tendency of the public schools. It is impossible to overestimate the value of reverent reading of Psalms and other parts of Scripture and devout repetition of the Lord's Prayer; but the inevitable impression given that nothing more than this is necessary is harmful. In thinking of the effects produced on American life by different religious bodies, I was always disposed to magnify the usefulness of the Episcopal Church.

My prejudices against Roman Catholicism as un-American, or as not best American, received a jolt about 1911 from reading some utterances of Cardinal Gibbons. Here was one speaking with authority and obvious effect in behalf of American ideals and of the dependence of these on religious belief. After that, I noticed every report of the Cardinal's utterances and read his books. I saw plainly that he was a great American, as I also believed Archbishop Ireland to be: and I wondered if they could be typical of the actual influence of Roman Catholicism in American life. Early in 1912, I went to call on the Cardinal with Dr. Manning to ask his interest in the Conference on Faith and Order. His kindness to us on that occasion won my personal veneration, and thereafter, more than ever, I was studying his career and activities as a possible illustration of the actual influence of American Catholicism. It gradually dawned on me that Catholicism coming from Italy by way of Ireland might possibly be naturalized and become as truly and loyally American as Catholicism from England or anywhere

else: and I had already shrewd suspicions that, whatever its degree and shade of Americanism, it was certainly full as Catholic! Still I always came back to the thought that its official use of Latin hopelessly handicapped it in competition with Catholicism using the English tongue.

About 1912, I was reading and rereading a number of books by English Catholic writers, especially some of Lord Acton's and Wilfrid Ward's. When I had finished the latter's *Life of Newman*, I remember saying, "On the whole, I am more in sympathy with Newman than with Keble and Pusey." At that time I was being disillusioned about Anglican Catholicity; and it was then that I saw the force of some of Newman's historical analogies which had formerly struck me as absurd. He compared Anglicans to Novatians, Donatists, Semi-Arians, Monophysites. The aptness of these analogies in relation to different points suddenly came home to me.* Details are not clear; but I know that from this time I felt that there was more to be said for High Church Anglicans who "went over" than I had hitherto assumed. In lecturing on the Oxford Movement, I always maintained that Newman and the rest had obeyed their consciences, done what they wished, and emphatically asserted that they never felt regrets: hence their action was right and not to be criticized. Nevertheless I maintained that they did not represent the most sound and stable elements in the English Church.

* One illustration he uses I do not understand; the comparison of the Church of England to Samaria. I can give poor reasons for this, but am sure that I miss the main point.

I contrasted them unfavorably with Keble, Pusey, Church, and Liddon. My three stock examples of the kind of men who "went to Rome" were Newman, W. G. Ward, and F. W. Faber, attracted respectively by overemphasis on Church authority, by mere logic, and by picturesque devotions. They were all good and able men, but not quite normal. I had a string of illustrations of peculiarities and of what I considered false judgments, not collected maliciously or with any conscious unfairness, but as evidence that ought not to be disregarded that these men were not altogether the equals of those who, in the same situation, stood by the English Church.* I talked of these things somewhat with Dr. Manning; but I think with no one else. Growing sympathy with those who "went over" was coincident with increasing irritation at Anglican ambiguity.

During the winter of 1913-14 I was in North Africa with headquarters at Tunis from the Epiphany until Ash Wednesday. On the first Sunday, I went to the English Chapel, in the churchyard of which the author of *Home, Sweet Home* was first buried. A C.M.S. chaplain preached on the continuity of Gospel truth through

* It is therefore altogether just that my old friends have recently been questioning my own sanity. How can one, they have asked, with chances to learn the best life in the Anglican Communion, ever prefer anything else? It can only be that he has lost his mind or his character; and the former is the more charitable assumption. This is all quite fair, as judging me by my own old standards, but in being relegated to the awkward squad of the feeble-minded, it is some comfort to reflect in what company, on my own showing in the days of Anglican complacency, I find myself.

St. Paul, Luther, John Wesley, and Charles Simeon. There was a Celebration of High Matins, at the end of which a benediction was pronounced, and the choir and most of the congregation left. Then followed, for the handful remaining, the monthly Lord's Supper, celebrated reverently, but with an unconscious slurring of every portion which represents the ancient Liturgy and great emphasis on all the Reformation additions. I was amazed to discover how utterly Zwinglian the Prayer Book could be made, never having heard such a rendering of it before. My first thought was, how outrageous for a clergyman of the Church of England to let his Protestant prejudices make him so disguise the Prayer Book's meaning; my second, that he was using the Prayer Book as it stood, simply laying emphasis unconsciously and conscientiously, on parts that seemed to him specially important. This was precisely what I did myself. He and I had the same method, only we laid our eclectic emphasis differently. I could not doubt that he was as convinced of being a "Prayer Book Churchman" as I was. The most obvious illustration of the difference between us was in the mode of administering Communion. When possible, I was in the habit of repeating the whole formula,—the ancient words retained in the First Prayer Book with the Zwinglian substitute of the Second which the Elizabethan Book combined—to each communicant. When there were many communicants and this was impracticable, I invariably repeated the ancient words, "The Body of our Lord Jesus Christ which was given for thee, preserve thy body and soul to everlasting life," to each, saying,

"Take and eat this in remembrance that Christ died for thee and be thankful" for every five or six. The Tunis chaplain did just the other thing. Before beginning to administer, he hurriedly recited the ancient words, and then to each communicant said the other part of the formula, often using only the words "Take and eat this." The effect was precisely what the revisers of 1552 intended, to give the impression that the "memorial bread," whatever it might be, was not to be thought of as actually the Body of Christ. It was the most flagrant exhibition of the sort I had ever seen; but in fairness I had to recognize that the chaplain was merely following my own method with a difference. He taught me better to understand clergy of his type, and of my own. We were diametrically opposed on matters of fundamental importance, but quite honest in using what the Church provided, which was however of so two-fold a character as to be susceptible of exactly opposite interpretations.* The Lord's Supper in the Tunis chapel made the same impression as the Sacrament in any Protestant congregation: the effect of it all, as an exhibition of lack of faith in the Eucharistic Reality,

* I always tried to use the Prayer Book loyally and exactly. I never consciously slurred anything except "Ye shall call upon them to hear sermons"! But the Tunis experience set me to scrutinizing my use of the Prayer Book, and I saw how much unconscious emphasis I used, e.g. "but *chiefly* ye shall provide," "seeing now that this child is regenerate," "the Body of our Lord Jesus Christ," "that He may dwell in us and we in Him," "with all Thy whole Church," etc. I also noticed more carefully the Reformation "Exhortations," which I used as prescribed, but was apt to hurry over as of comparative unimportance.

was utterly depressing. That afternoon I went to Benediction in the Catholic Cathedral and felt better!

After that, although I went to the English chapel for the infrequent Communions, I adopted the Cathedral as my parish-church, was usually present at two Masses on Sundays, attended weddings, funerals, and catechizings, and heard a series of admirable sermons by Monsignor Pons on the Sanctity of Family Life. These were given at the "Men's Mass" when the body of the Cathedral was crowded with men; and the Archbishop (Monsignor Combes) was present. At these services I came to appreciate the use of one ecclesiastical language. I liked the familiar Latin of the Mass and of the Psalms and Canticles at Vespers and found its use in hymns. On the first Sunday, the hymn was *Adeste fideles,* which I happened to know; and so, though having no book, I was able to join lustily with the French, Italians, and Maltese, who formed the congregation. It was the same way in the *O Salutaris Hostia* and *Tantum ergo* at Benediction.* During the whole of my stay in Tunis I found the Cathedral services restful and strengthening and felt more entirely at home in church than at any time I could remember. So in African churches elsewhere, at St. Monica's in Souk Ahras (Thagaste), St. Augustine's Cathedral in Hippone, the churches in Bone, Kairouan, Sfax, and especially the Primatiale at Carthage. There was nothing disturbing

* It was in Tunis that I heard *O Salutaris Hostia* sung to Beethoven's "Germany," which I afterward adopted as the tune for *O Saving Victim,* invariably sung at Eucharists at Bishopstead and Birchmere.

in the way of the superstitious devotions of "modern Rome." My theory was that this exceptional state of things was accounted for by the strength of the great African traditions. Archbishop Combes, who had been St. Augustine's successor in Hippone from which he was translated to become St. Cyprian's successor in Carthage, could not ignore the standards set by these heroes of the Church's earlier days. He and his people were Catholics and not distinctly "Roman" at all.

Later I saw various churches in Sicily and Naples and went to Mass in some of them, never discovering anything disturbing to my evangelical standards. I reflected often how fortunate I was to have formed my impressions of things Roman in places where, for one reason or another, the innovations of mediæval and modern "Rome" were held in check: in the ancient Roman basilicas, in Milan, in Africa, where ancient tradition was cogent; in France, where Gallican traditions were influential; in Germany affected by Protestant Evangelicalism; in Belgium, where I knew something of Bruges and Louvain, and had a high opinion of the clergy from the one I knew and from reading Cardinal Mercier's *Conferences* sent me years ago by Dr. Huntington Richards. I could imagine reasons for superiority in these places to the ordinary rank and file of Roman Catholic churches. It was not until two years ago that it dawned upon me that I was forever discovering exceptions and had never yet seen a single example of what I supposed to be the rule! I gasped at the thought that these Catholic exceptions were the invariable consequence of Roman rule; and that the

bugbears were simply those of my Protestant imagination. From 1914 must I date the growing suspicion that Roman Catholic might not be so complete a contradiction in terms as I had thought. When I came home in 1914, I told friends that my trip had "spoiled" me, specifying that it had revived all my tastes for ecclesiastical archæology, which had been dormant since coming to Delaware, and made me keen to spend time about the Mediterranean. What I did not say, or recognize till later, was that the winter in the Cathedral in Tunis had made it impossible for me ever to be content with the ways of the Protestant Episcopal Church. I went about my work as usual; but it had lost sense of full reality.

CHAPTER X

ATTRACTION TO ROMANISM

However much I may have liked the Church in North Africa, I tried to remember always that my work was in Delaware. Yet I was not able to keep clear of the Roman question. In 1915, there was an animated discussion in the Episcopal Church over the advisability of participating in the Panama Conference. I was opposed to this on grounds both of principle and of policy and expressed my views in a Charge to the Delaware Clergy. One whose criticism I asked was the Reverend Dr. Laird of Wilmington. From him I had a very kind letter in which, as I knew he would, he candidly opposed my position. In this letter he said:

"In spite of its boasted Catholicity, the Roman Church has not only failed to do its duty in South America, but has done, and is still doing much positive harm. We must, it seems to me, take this into account. . . . So long as the Roman Church is as it is, I am frankly anti-Roman; and I believe that a serious and lasting injury will be done to the true meaning of Catholic Churchmanship, if we act on the principle that their technical adherence to the order and doctrine of the primitive Church entitles them to more recognition than should be accorded those upon whose lives the world may look and know without doubt that they have been with Christ. 'By their fruits ye shall know them.'"

If to one cause more than another, in what has been a complicated process, I owe my conversion to Roman Catholicism, it is to this letter of Dr. Laird's. It led me to undertake a task which would not have been thought of without some such stimulating occasion. This was to learn all I could of the work and influence of the Roman Catholic Church in the United States. In the Panama discussions had been many assertions of the " rottenness " of the Roman system in South and Central American countries. I believed them exaggerated, but had no direct knowledge. From the good I knew of Roman Catholicism in European countries and North Africa, the impressions of the last still vivid, I was confident that the system could not be wholly worthless elsewhere; but I did not know facts. It occurred to me, however, that the practical thing was to know about the Roman Church, not in South America or North Africa, but in North America, especially close at home. I determined therefore to make a special study of this, being actuated by two distinct motives.

The first was simply to be ordinarily intelligent. I had ventured to speak and write of conditions in the Christian world, and at the time had a textbook dealing with such matters ready for the printers. It was distinctly my duty to know what I was talking about; and I was humiliated to think that I had neglected so obvious a task for many years. I presumed to instruct on matters connected with the Roman Catholic Church, deriving most of my notions from the thirteenth century and the other side of the Atlantic. I wished to be ac-

curate and fair. Hence I saw the duty of taking a special course on Roman Catholicism in America.

The other motive was personal and not laudable. Dr. Laird gave me a text which has dominated my thought for four years. "By their fruits ye shall know them." Although I believed that he was mistaken in some of his judgments, and that I should not agree with his general estimates, I suspected that, on the whole, in comparing Episcopalianism and Romanism, he was probably right. I had become very critical of my own Church and was already feeling strongly certain lures of Rome. I thought it altogether likely that a little actual contact with Roman Catholicism close at hand would give me a healthy appreciation of the good people and good works with whom I was associated, and quickly rid me of my Romanizing nonsense! I deliberately tried to find out about things, half-expecting, and even half-hoping, to be disgusted! I remembered the sermon I had heard when a boy and imagined that Roman priests were in the habit of telling their people they were "asses to calumniate." I knew of Tyrrell's remark about the man who left the house with smoky chimneys for one where the chimneys were all right, only to find that "the drains were out of order." I had a horrible dread of mediæval plumbing, and thought that a little experience might give me sense to value rightly the modern conveniences of Episcopalianism. I had not the slightest wish to flee to others that I knew not of, and felt certain would prove a good deal worse! I had heard reports of catechisms teaching that no faith need be kept with heretics and that it was a venial sin

to steal from Protestants. If things like this were true, I wished to know it so as to be rid of illusions; if they weren't, I wished to be in a position to deny them and secure fair play. "By their fruits ye shall know them" is the Divine test. I took it as a motto in my ecclesiastical perplexities.

The first consequence was to open my eyes to the real significance of many things in the Episcopal Church. I had hitherto stuck to the theories and, so long as I believed them right, ignored facts. The ideal Episcopal Church exhibited in action the principles of the Quadrilateral; and it did not concern me that most Episcopal churches of my acquaintance seemed not to do so. They were simply exceptions which proved the rule. I was now to see more clearly that exceptions practically without exception constitute a rule, and that principles may be nullified by policies. From 1915 on, I was applying the test of "fruits" to the Protestant Episcopal Church, looking on every priest, every parish, every professed Churchman, as a specimen, and trying to analyze the significance of each as a "fruit" of the Anglican system. The result was the conviction that Protestant fruits implied Protestant stock and roots; and that it is unreasonable to expect to gather Catholic figs from Puritan thistles. This effort crystallized opinions which had for several years been floating in solution.

The second consequence was to discover that between the Catholicism of North Africa and that of North America there seemed to be no appreciable difference, and that instead of being weaned from Romanism, I

was disposed to like it better than ever. As I had opportunities—which were few—I attended Roman services, at the Cathedrals in New York, Philadelphia, Baltimore, Cleveland, and Portland, and some parish churches in Philadelphia and New York. I felt even more at home than in Tunis! The chief impression was that the Mass is primarily worship of Our Lord, affecting minds and manners as well as morals of successive congregations of thousands as they go from the beauty and silence of the great Sacrifice to their myriad homes. It was unlike anything I had known at home before, for even when compared with attempts for the same effect inspired by identical beliefs and motives, it is one thing to have the Church doing these things always for all her children, and another to have a good priest struggling for them against the inertia of his congregation.

I was prepared to find the Roman Church superior to the Episcopalian in reverent administration of Sacraments, but less effective in its ministration of the Word: I expected to like the Mass, but to disparage the preaching. The expectation was not realized. In Roman churches I have heard every kind of poor sermon I ever heard elsewhere except two; a discourse on some subject of general interest in which the Christian religion is vaguely referred to, or one obviously intended to serve as exhibition of the ability and personal fascination of a self-conscious preacher. Nevertheless, I have never heard one which, whatever may have been its crudities and awkwardnesses, was not an effort to expound some Christian truth in a practical way, with

greatest reverence for Holy Scripture and constant recognition of the authority of "Our Divine Lord." The kind of preaching which I have invariably heard in Roman churches is that which, as a boy at St. Paul's, I came to believe in as ideal; and, as a contrast to that which I have more recently been accustomed to, it brought home to me how uncommon in Episcopal churches this has become. In my own preaching I aimed at giving a simple message in Our Lord's Name; yet I recognized that in this regard it would compare unfavorably with that of any young Catholic priest. I had come to care very little for sermons; but I look forward to them in Catholic churches, knowing that there will be a simple exposition of Scripture, probably of the Gospel for the day, exegetically sound because following the great theologians, aiming at stirring the conscience, probably not striking in delivery, but obviously useful, and in no way interrupting the spirit of worship. I have heard very eloquent sermons in Catholic churches. My mother went with me to a Lenten service in St. Patrick's Cathedral, New York, and said she had never seen me more utterly absorbed by a sermon than the one we heard from Father William B. Martin. The most eloquent long address I ever listened to was delivered by Cardinal O'Connell at a mass-meeting in Madison Square Garden, and the best address on a religious subject by a layman, by Mr. Bourke Cochran at a dinner in Wilmington. On the whole, so nearly as I can judge, the preaching of the Roman Catholic priesthood in the United States can rank with the best.

I was sure that in Roman churches I should miss

hymns, for which I have a liking that is Methodist in intensity; and I know well how the intelligent use of them can assist instruction as well as devotion. In this I was sure Protestants have an advantage; and I think so still. But I have discovered that Catholics make much use of hymns, though there is apparently less congregational singing in this country than in some places abroad; and for devoutness and intelligence in singing I have never heard anything better than the hymns used in some places at the 9.30 Masses. It is certain that Protestants have in certain ways advantages over Catholics in details of method; but these are not so great or so numerous as is often imagined. Attendance of Roman services did not rid me of the North African glamour. It was not a case of " came to scoff and remained to pray," but of expecting to scorn and being constrained to praise.

Yet assuming that Roman clergy could do very well in church, I doubted whether in general education they were the equals of Protestant ministers, and whether their general influence was making for highest education. Plainly they did not make use of the advantages of American colleges and universities to a great extent; and their people were for the most part from the less educated classes. I was convinced that Anglicanism was *par excellence* the devotee of " sound learning," and although recognizing that much that passes for this is nothing but learned sound, I held tenaciously to the conviction that Anglicanism is synonym for learning and devotion to Truth. Individual Anglicans may fail; but their system is professedly devoted to sound learn-

ing, and the scholars of the English Church represent a great hope for Christendom. Whatever excellencies others may have, it is an Anglican distinction that it fosters devout and fearless Christian scholarship. I have not lost one whit of my veneration for the scholars of the English Church, or for those in the American Episcopal Church who, amid many difficulties, do their best to live up to the traditions of the long line of scholarly Anglican divines. But with this went the assumption that they monopolize "sound learning," and that there could be little or no real scholarship among Roman Catholics, since Curial authority stifled criticism, and fearless statements of fact were likely to find themselves on the Index. If I had much conceit about this, it was not for myself whose ignorance I too well knew, but for the clergy of Anglican succession as a class, and for an indisputable Anglican ideal. Such Roman Catholic writers as I knew could undoubtedly hold their own with scholars; but as usual I assumed them to be exceptions.

This conceit received a severe shock when I first examined the *Catholic Encyclopædia*, undertaken at the instance of Cardinal Farley, and a product of Roman Catholic scholarship in America. A distinctly sobering effect is in store for any clergyman of the Episcopal Church who wishes to examine this and then imagine what he and his colleagues would have made of a similar attempt! The impression given by this will be deepened if he makes a special study of the results of Benedictine scholarship along their special lines. The one subject on which I can trust my own judgment at

all is Church History, on which I have been doing special work for almost thirty years. On this subject I have read almost everything by Anglican writers, many other books in English, some German and some French, and have dabbled in originals. Lately I have been reading Roman Catholic writers covering ground with which I considered myself fairly familiar. They have shed floods of light: some of them are the best I know: some do bits of work I longed for in seminary days and could not find: they have given a sense of freedom which I never had in reading only Anglican authorities: and by revealing unsuspected abysses of ignorance they have made me wish to do all my History work over again. If this were possible, my lectures would have a fulness, accuracy, and freedom they never before possessed. I should not maintain that Roman Catholics as a class are intellectually superior to Protestants, but I do assert that Protestant superiority is not so great as is often assumed, and that there is much superiority on the other side.

The tests of "fruits," however, is to be applied not so much to things ecclesiastical and intellectual as to things moral. What sort of moral teaching do American Catholics receive; and what are its consequences in national life? Many suspect that flagrant offences against truth and honesty are condoned by Catholic casuistry. I wished to inform myself as well as I could as to this fact, and to do so made a collection of devotional books, catechisms, pamphlets, and tracts, representing the instruction on many points which Catholics receive. In some of those dealing with matters of con-

troversy I found slap-dash statements in the interests of reckless partisanship which would not stand scientific tests, yet could find no parallel for these in the work of specialists of recognized authority.* I found a great deal of extravagant devotional language which did not commend itself to my taste; but in such matters there can be no fixed standard, and due provision is made for all sorts. These are details. The main fact was that I discovered a body of varied practical teaching for all classes of people, inculcating the highest standards of strict morality and affording practical training in the science of holiness, altogether admirable, and having no parallel in the similar literature of my own religious body or of any Protestant denomination of which I had knowledge. How I wished all Delaware boys and girls could have the benefit of such instruction in morals as

* This sort of thing is to be found in similar literature of all religious propaganda. I never discovered in Roman Catholic tracts any statements more misleading than I have seen in Episcopalian literature of the same character. Catholic criticism of Protestants seems distinctly less unfair and less scurrilous than Protestant criticisms of Catholics, so nearly as I can judge from fairly extensive reading. Luther was the great past-master of foul-mouthed abuse and of *ex parte* argument; and his pre-eminence has passed to some of his followers. There is deplorable sin of this sort on both sides; but Protestant pots have no reason to be severe with Catholic kettles. I am especially squeamish in regard to sweeping statements in historical matters; and it is as true of Catholics as of Protestants that the inaccurate generalizations of tracts have no analogies in the writings of real historians. I quarrel with rash assertions in certain pamphlets, but find nothing similar in the discussion of the matters involved in such writers as Gasquet and Duchesne.

I found provided for young Catholics! Not to recognize excellence of this sort is sin against the Holy Ghost. I read many newspapers and periodicals, was delighted with the tone and influence of parish papers, and the obvious excellence of the Catholic press.*

The salient feature of much of this teaching, as it is of Catholic pulpits, is constant insistence on the sanctity of marriage and of the home as the basis of personal and social morality. Those who know that the Christian home is the very sanctuary and citadel of all that is sound in national life, cannot too highly appreciate the unflinching stand for this taken by the Roman Catholic Church. Christian homes of Protestants are often of the best: but I doubt whether any religious body teaches the sanctity of the home with the

* Shortly after I had begun these investigations, I began to receive a great deal of Catholic literature from an anonymous source, including many things much to my purpose, which I should not otherwise have come across. Only recently have I discovered the sender, Mr. John V. Lawton, of Philadelphia. His explanation was as follows:

"About eight years ago, I called upon you at the Parish House in Wilmington and had a talk in reference to some sort of demonstration; but it was a talk of only two or three minutes. For some reason I thought of you many times after that; and about four years ago, while in Wilmington, I met a grocer with whom I did business, who talked about you. Shortly after I happened to pass you on the street in Wilmington. I looked after you and the thought entered my mind, 'How nice it would be if some day Bishop Kinsman did as Cardinal Newman did.' For some reason or other, which I am really not able to explain, the thought of you lingered in my mind, and something seemed to say, 'Interest yourself in Bishop Kinsman.' What I have tried to do since, you already know all about."

force and persistence of Roman Catholics: at any rate Episcopalians do not. I am not denying the existence of their good homes, merely affirming what I know of the actual, effective teaching of the Church. With this in Catholic teaching goes insistence on respect for elders and superiors, immensely helped by training for behavior in church, and systematic inculcation of obedience. There is nothing in this better than in Protestant instructions, but apparently much more systematic application of it in educational systems. Among Catholics as among non-Catholics are many failures to live up to standards; but what I was forced to see was that there is no doubt what the Catholic standards are, and they are nailed to the mast. Against all the evils that threaten America by insidious undermining of the foundations of the home, there is no stronger or more effective bulwark than the Roman Catholic Church. I had some appreciation of this, though less than I had later, when I stated in a pamphlet in 1915:

"How thankful we should be for the thousands of saintly lives which are, and always have been, nurtured within the great Communion of the Latin races. None but a blind and bigoted partisan can shut his eyes to such inspiring facts; and none but a fallen Christian can fail ungrudgingly to acknowledge them. All honor to the Roman Church for all the good it does as a mighty bulwark for the central principles of faith, and, in these days of defiance of all authority, for its resolute countenance on the whole of the sanctity of marriage and family life. Doubtless in parts of the Roman Communion, as in other Communions, there are sad examples of failure and degradation. Facts of this sort we

cannot ignore; neither ought we to ignore greater facts on the other side. We wish to see, confess, and thank God for, the virtues of all in the Christian world, most of all in that most influential of Communions on whose loyalty and sanctity so much for all the world depends."

Akin to this is dealing from the standpoint of religion with economic and social questions. My investigations along this line, to which I must refer in another connection, have resulted in two convictions: (1) that Roman Catholics more than others in dealing with these never lose the distinctly Christian standpoint; and (2) that they have unusually full and accurate knowledge of the actual facts in the industrial and social world to which Christianity must be applied.

Of all tests by "fruits" the greatest has been the War. A dozen friends have spoken to me of this: "The War has revealed the hollowness of Romanism. You see how moral claims seem to have been subordinated to supposed political expediency." Of the function of the Church in international politics I have been learning what I can; but as my opinions are unformed, I cannot speak of them without obviously "thinking in public." But in various ways I have tried to see how Roman Catholicism has stood the test of the War; and two impressions have been clearer than others: (1) that its stability has been thrown into prominence by contrast with ecclesiastical systems dependent on the State; and (2) that Catholics made as good records as the best in the American Army.

The first of these has come chiefly from thinking of

the Eastern Churches. The fetters imposed on their activity by political dependence have been obvious. The fate of the Russian Church is wholly uncertain. In spite of the strong basis of faith in the Russian people, it would seem as if the Church were in danger of overthrow along with the government which has hitherto been its support. Contrasted with the fate of all the Churches in the East, is the steady persistence of the life of the Roman Catholic Church everywhere, even in the countries where it was most affected by the violence of War. It has emerged from the War as it was when it entered the cloud of conflict. The same contrast has been suggested by hints of change coming to the Church of England. Could it stand if it ceased to be the Establishment? It is made not by position, but by possession, possession of Catholic churches and of State endowments. Could it survive disendowment and dispossession? The War has emphasized the necessity of political independence of the Church, even when men as Christians have had to take special part in national struggles.

Frankly I did not expect that Roman Catholics in America would make as good a showing as others in doing America's part in the War. It seemed to me that nothing could be better than what I saw in members of my own Church and others with whom they were especially associated, of large-minded view of the moral issues of the War, of determination to show the spirit of sacrifice, and of readiness to respond to every appeal made in behalf of Christian civilization threatened by the German aggression. I thought, and think still, that

no better showing was made by any similar class of American citizens. I did not think that Roman Catholics were likely to make as good a record, and scrutinized them closely. In the end I could not see that they differed from others in accepting national obligations, though they had less money to give for War funds, nor in the spirit of religious consecration for the national tasks. Their leaders kept pace with the best, even if they did not forge ahead. But in response to the great challenge for all that was best in national life, they did not fail.

The most obvious test seemed to be afforded by the life of the Army with its thirty-five per cent. of Catholics, although these represented less than twenty per cent. of the population. I sought reasons for this fact and was told, that the number of voluntary enlistments among Catholics was proportionately high; and, by a doctor who acted as examiner on a draft-board, that one reason so many Catholics passed the physical tests was that they were comparatively free from diseases due to vicious habits. Their record in the fighting is well known. I had few opportunities to see anything of soldiers, although in travelling about I was always on the lookout for them as travelling companions, and a number of times encountered young Catholics. Occasionally they spoke of religious duties in a matter-of-fact way, always assuming that wherever they went, the Church must be with them. A soldier from Camp Devens told me how he and six others got permission to get up at five o'clock to go to Mass in a church three miles off, getting back for their first duties in camp

at seven. The impression he gave was of feeling the natural and normal necessity of the Church without the least self-consciousness in discharging his duties. I believe that this was typical. It is unlikely that Catholic soldiers and sailors made more use of their religious life than others; but it seems to come from their training, that this is viewed as natural and necessary, is accepted as matter of course as the one sustaining thing in danger, and, with its constant reference to the unseen world, lessens the fear of death. "Protestantism is pretty good to live by; but Catholicism seems better to die by." Comments of this kind have been made by observers at the front. The Protestant imagination that "the Catholic Church has no hold on its men" is sheer superstition. To see this, all that is necessary is to attend several Masses at any town church: and to know how the young fellows feel about it, inspect a few Knights of Columbus. They will not indulge in edifying conversation; but find out what they *do* about church.

I have been much impressed by the record in Warwork of the K. of C. I expected that they would fall behind the better equipped and much more experienced Y.M.C.A. But this seems not to have been the case. To begin with, which was to be expected, they were determined to take the Church everywhere, that soldiers in camp and trenches need not miss Sunday Mass. First things were put first; and the religious side of their work was of primary importance. But their record was good in all other ways; and it seems to be generally acknowledged that they have taken the lead

in looking after the present needs of disbanded soldiers. Tested by works as well as by faith, they show up well. And what is true of them has been true of Catholic citizens generally.

From all this it is evident how strongly I was being attracted to the Roman Church. There was a gradual disintegration of difficulties of which I shall speak separately. It was becoming clear that prejudices were vanishing on closer acquaintance. Nevertheless I still believed the Episcopal to be part of the Catholic Church, myself to be priest and Bishop, and my one responsibility for work in Delaware. I fought doubts by exposing myself to every influence that would steady me, cultivated people representing the best aspects of our Church work, and avoided those who depressed me. Every consideration of association and interest tied me to my post, to say nothing of the wish on principle to stick to my assigned duty. I resolved that, if the doubts ever appeared insoluble, I should promptly give up; but I tried to prevent, or at least postpone, their doing so, until after the Lambeth Conference. So although I was gladly recognizing good things in Roman Catholicism and wished to see it prosper, although I was willing to accept its claims if I could, I was fighting hard to keep my faith in Anglican Catholicity. In the Episcopal Church I had been born and reared; it had done everything for me; I should not give it up if I could help.

Moreover, at the first suggestion of possible change of Communion, I had not thought of "Rome" as the alternative. I had considered the possible function of

Eastern Orthodoxy in America only to end with the conclusion that Westerns must be trained by some form of Western Catholicity. I had thought very much more of the Old Catholics, with whose position that of High Church Anglicans was virtually identical; and in looking toward a general readjustment of ecclesiastical relations in future, it had seemed to me possible that Protestant Episcopalians might separate to coalesce with their natural affinities, the left wing with Reformed Episcopalians or Methodists, the right with Old Catholics. I knew that Old Catholics would make modifications in their discipline making it easy for Anglicans to amalgamate. In 1898, I had some correspondence with Bishop Antony Koslowski of the Polish Old Catholic Church in regard to a congregation of Portuguese in New Bedford, which he eventually took under his jurisdiction. He was ready to allow, though not willingly, the use of the vulgar tongue instead of Latin, communion of the laity in both kinds, and marriage of the clergy. Other Old Catholic Bishops have been willing, I believe, to make similar concessions. Yet the result of such observations as I could make left me with the impression that Old Catholicism had no great part to play in America. Ultimately I came to see that for myself Romanism was the only alternative. I remember saying to Bishop Rhinelander in 1917, "If ever I give up, it will be altogether; and the alternative is Rome."

Anglican Bishops must in some way relate their position to that of the Roman Catholic hierarchy. In England, it seems simple. The Anglican Bishops con-

stitute the rightful hierarchy of the Church of the Realm; those of the "Italian Mission" are intruders. In America, Low Church Bishops may think of themselves as belonging to a "Gospel ministry," one of whose functions is to combat Romanism. Although they would concede that Roman Bishops had every right to propagate their faith in a free country, they would view them as foes of pure Christianity. Not so with High Church Bishops. They believe the Roman Bishops, as they believe themselves, to represent the episcopate of the Catholic Church, although belonging to a different line of descent; few, if any, would hold others intruders on the ground that the first Bishop in America was an Anglican. I imagine that most feel as I did, that the two lines of Catholic Bishops have obvious mission to different classes of people in a land of mixed racial antecedents. High Church Bishops think of their work as moving along lines parallel to that of the Romans, progressing by different methods, and emphasizing different aspects of truth, yet as essentially part of one Divinely inspired movement to win America to Catholicism. They look forward to ultimate unity, believing in their Church as "of the Reconciliation," one of whose functions is to reveal Catholicism stripped of "accretions." They would think of themselves, not as hostile to the Roman hierarchy, merely as commissioned to minister to different sets of people in America.

Recognition of Roman excellences, or even feeling of its attractions for myself, did not disturb me so long as I believed the Episcopal Church to have the best sort

of Catholicism for such people as I knew in Delaware. Yet by 1917, I was wondering whether, of the two kinds of Catholicism, the Roman might not provide for one set of people as well as another, was feeling strongly the evil of division in the Catholic forces, and the anomaly of two Bishops in the same place. If in Delaware there was an intruder, I began to be suspicious that it was not the Roman Bishop of Wilmington! Moreover, in Anglican theory, its episcopate, freed from papal oppression, is more freely and fully episcopal. I knew this to be nonsense. Without knowing much of the work of Bishop Monaghan of Wilmington, I knew that in his work he was more of a Bishop than I was. This was for no local or personal reason. If I looked at my near neighbours, there was nothing more intensely episcopal in Bishop Rhinelander than in Archbishop Prendergast, or in Bishop Murray than in Cardinal Gibbons. This was due, not to differences in character or ability of individual men, but to differences in conditions under which work had to be done in their respective Communions. The Papal Episcopate in action was more episcopal than the Protestant Episcopate. I saw this before the time came when I took "protestant" for more than silent partner in an ill-assorted firm.

In my own case, there was an unusual chance for a Bishop to count for much in his work, owing to the smallness of the diocese, more like a big straggling parish. I knew most of our people, in their homes as well as in church; and I could do much to bring people together. But this was not as a Bishop, but as Per-

sonal-Friend-at-Large. My characteristic function was not as celebrant of the Bishop's Mass, of which Delaware Episcopalians had no conception, in a Cathedral, which as more than a name would have been an impossibility, but as host at an evening reception at Bishopstead! My position of vantage was social, not ecclesiastical.

In thinking much of the ultimate one Catholicism for Delaware and for America, I had to think of the relation to this of the perpetuating of the Protestant Episcopal Church. At the same time, I was restudying the history of the English Reformation with special reference to the responsibility for schism, and thinking of the essential character of schism. My investigation into the working facts of Roman Catholicism in America had no bearing on this except to show that Romanism was more useful than I had supposed. The conceit of an Episcopalian dies hard, and belief in a special Divine mission of High Anglicanism harder still.

It made me pause in approaching certain apparently inevitable conclusions to reflect on the isolation of my position in the Episcopal Church, and on the presumption of disagreeing with my elders and betters. It seemed to me that Catholic Anglicanism was losing ground; older Bishops whom I specially revered, like those of Pittsburgh, Connecticut, and New Hampshire, out of longer experience, thought just the contrary. Of all things it seemed the height of presumption for me to venture to differ from the Bishops of Vermont and Oxford. Yet in my own mind I was defying them both on the subject of Reservation. I agreed that it was

not permissible for Anglicans without some authoritative sanction; but I did not agree that it was in itself a misuse of the Eucharist, or that it led to abuses: I believed that it ought to be sanctioned and encouraged as a legitimate stimulus to devotion. To Bishop Hall I wrote all this. About the same time I read Gore's *Manual,* and thought of it, "As theory, it seems as plausible and appeals to me as much as ever; but it represents nothing actual but the special brand of belief of a few fastidious scholars. In Delaware nobody holds it. I am nearest approach to it; and my confidence is oozing!" And then I meditated on Elijah under the juniper tree!

Prior to 1917 I had no acquaintance with Catholic clergy beyond the merest touch-and-go contact, with the exception that ever since going to Delaware, I had known the Reverend William Temple, D.D., of Wilmington, who had once sent me a kind note, and on several occasions was very helpful in answering inquiries about books. Yet with only one priest had I any close contact, and this only during the last months of my living in Delaware.

In 1917, however, I made some good Catholic friends. A lady in south Delaware, who as a girl had attended the Visitation Academy in Wilmington, at a time of great trouble expressed a wish that she might get in touch with Sister Marie Gabrielle of the Visitation, who had been her best friend when she was a girl. Without telling her, I found out from Bishop Monaghan that the Sister was still living, and wrote to her, telling her about her old pupil and asking that she write her. This

led to a correspondence and friendship between me and Sister Marie Gabrielle, to my calling at the Convent on three occasions, on one of which I met the entire Community, and eventually to my speaking very frankly to Sister Marie Gabrielle of my own views on matters ecclesiastical. It interested me immensely to know something of the lives of these "doves" of St. Francis de Sales, to think of them as a reservoir of spiritual force in the centre of Wilmington; and I felt the charm of their conversation which showed that delicate gayety which is only possible in consecrated lives. I asked Sister Marie Gabrielle many questions about the Order and the Convent; and the messages from the Sisters gave a touch and tone to two years unlike anything else I had known in Delaware. Of course, they prayed for my conversion; but they did not badger me, and were content to leave it in the hands of God. I cannot measure exactly the influence of this contact with the Visitation Sisters except in one definite detail. They gave me the *Life of Bishop Alfred A. Curtis* of Wilmington, who lies buried within their enclosure. The book influenced me in giving a picture of the work of a Bishop expressed in terms of the life of the peninsula I knew so well, an experience in Delaware which I could compare with Bishop Coleman's and my own. It was a humiliating revelation. I felt like an Indian in the presence of a white man; and this, not only as recognizing my personal inferiority to a man of saintly character, but in seeing a picture of episcopal life suggestive of the spirit of St. Ignatius and St. Cyprian, which had never been possible for any of the three Bishops of

Delaware owing to the "locally adapted" character of the Episcopal Church. This deepened impressions already forming in other ways. Of all my friends in Delaware, there are none for whom I have greater affection and respect than the Sisters of the Visitation.

This contact with the Sisters led to my receiving a call from their chaplain, the Reverend Charles Augustine Dougherty of the Oblate Fathers. I saw Father Dougherty half a dozen times, went to walk with him, and asked many questions about his training and work. We never discussed any controversial subject; but I was deeply influenced by what I could learn of him of the work of Catholic priests, fitting in as it did with what I was getting from books. I was constantly comparing it with what corresponded to it in the lives of my own clergy, feeling chiefly the comparative undiscipline, not only of my own personal life, but of the Episcopalian clergy as a body. As priests, we seemed amateurs, while Roman Catholics were professionals. I thought of it the more in talking with Father Dougherty as he was young enough to be my son. During the summer of 1918, I read a number of books on Moral Theology, to find out something of the nature and standards of discipline in the confessional. These also deepened the sense of lamentable lack of discipline in the Episcopal Church, of regret for its obscuration of the Sacrament of Penance, and of the loss of practical usefulness in the moral training of its people. At the same time, it enhanced one's veneration for the actual work done in its care of souls by the Roman Catholic Church.

Books by Roman Catholic writers gave me no new notions of my own Church. After reading Canon Moyes' *Aspects of Anglicanism*, the only comment I could make was, "How well he understands." I read various books by converts; Benson's *Confessions* and *Papers of a Pariah*, Ruville's *Back to Holy Church* and *Humility, the True Talisman*, Maturin's *Price of Unity*, Ronald Knox's *Spiritual Æneid*, and the *Life of Aubrey De Vere*. In all of them, I saw that I had travelled far along the same road, yet not all its length; and in the last of them found the closest parallels to my own reflections. Without venturing to put myself into the same category with Aubrey De Vere, whose character and experience were wholly different, and whose profundity of insight and power of expression were far beyond me, I could not fail to see that his general view of ecclesiastical affairs was that which for me was proving decisive. By 1917, I had come to think of "Rome" as, on the whole, the best of Communions. As I wrote one friend, "If I had children, I should wish them brought up Roman Catholics." Yet I could not think of it as alone the Church. My attitude was that of patronizing critic, not of disciple; of *connaisseur*, not of sinner seeking salvation. During the summer of 1918, I was as near "going over" as at any time until the actual moment of decision came a year later; and was never apparently farther away than in the following spring, just after leaving Delaware, when people in Wilmington were announcing my conversion to newspapers which bombarded me with telegrams asking for confirmation. There were many fluctuations.

Newspaper comment at the time of my leaving my diocese brought numerous messages from Catholics, kind and shy promises of prayers from priests and others, sympathetic communications from converts, a number from people who later sent helpful books. But none assailed me with arguments, or tried to force matters by hastening conviction. I am told that I was remembered in many prayers and masses; but so far as discussion went, I was left alone. The only pressure brought to bear on me was by Episcopalian friends, a few of whom tried to hurry me out of the Episcopal Church to gratify their curiosity as to what I was going to do. I groped my own way to the portals of the Church, and found many to welcome and help, but none who tried to drag me in. I have had to separate from all old friends, to lose a few; but I seem to be finding many new ones. From those whom I have left, I have had most kind and generous treatment, especially from the magnanimous Bishops of the Episcopal Church. From Delaware, the only messages have been assurances that, although official ties are broken, personal relations remain the same as ever.

"*September* 20, 1919.

"Is your letter an instance of 'No case; abuse the plaintiff's attorney'? You say nothing of the English Reformation and actual work of the Roman Church, to which mine refers, but simply pitch into *me*. I undertake no self-defence. I admit I am very unsatisfactory, a very poor champion of any cause: nevertheless there is a good deal of sense in my opinions. You may give sentence against me on all the counts in your indictment, if you

choose, though I myself might qualify the judgments just a bit. Take the items.

"'Out of health and incapable of calm judgment.' It is quite true that I have been frequently unwell during the past ten years; but the illness seems to have been the result of perplexities, not the cause of them. During the past two summers, in which I have been reaching my decisions, I have been in excellent condition, and am perfectly well now. Several, who have seen me lately, say that I have dropped off ten years since last spring; and this in spite of keen anxieties. I plead 'Not guilty.'

"'Academic and *doctrinaire*.' Again, 'not guilty.' In my academic days, I was quite content with my Anglicanism. It was practical experience that punctured it.

"'Ungrateful.' If by this you mean that I fail to recognize that all sorts of good things have come to me through the Episcopal Church, you are wrong. If you blame me for not holding my post after I have lost faith in what it stands for, or for thinking that I am bound to say plainly what I now think, and why I think it, you are wrong again; but this time not as to fact merely, but as to principle.

"'Diocesan worries.' I don't know to what you refer. Of course I have had plenty of them as part of every day's work. I should be utterly ashamed of myself if I hadn't. But I know of no bishop who seems to have had so few. As for those of the past two years, I have been too far gone to heed them. A dying man is indifferent to sounds in the next room.

"'Levity.' If you really think I have any, 'Guilty'—but glad of it! I didn't know I had any levity left. But I consider myself fully entitled to all vestiges of youthful frivolity which have survived the ordeals of the past ten years, and regard them as proofs of strength and sweet-

ness of character! In any guilt of this sort I glory; and you may fine me for contempt of court if you please!

"I could make out a better case than you have done. You have omitted the two charges on which you could score most, 'narrowly ecclesiastical' and 'antiquarian.' I should plead 'guilty' to 'ecclesiastical,' though not to 'narrowly,' and shamelessly concede that I care more for a single Catacomb than for a whole batch of Caroline Divines!

"The whole case against me may go by default; but I wish you would weigh what I have written."

"*October* 4, 1919.

"Your imagination is very charitable; but you are all wrong. I am not a bit like what you think, and disclaim all the imputed good qualities. It is not my 'heart and soul' that are struggling, but my head. You seem to picture a gentle lamb, sighing for the shelter of the Fold. Nonsense. As matter of fact, I am simply butting in like an old goat!"

CHAPTER XI

THE PAPACY

The many things in the Roman Catholic Church which challenged admiration, and forced recognition of its value as a religious force in America, did not demonstrate the possibility of accepting the Roman claims, even if they created a disposition to reconsider them. So far as I can judge of my attitude toward them in the last few years, it has been more respectful, but not less critical than formerly. In 1915, I carefully stated reasons why I could not be a Roman Catholic; and there was certainly no change a year later. But since that time there has been a steady disintegration of old difficulties, the effects of which only became apparent during the past summer (1919).

For years it has seemed to me that the trend of things in the Christian world is to give Catholics and Unitarians possession of the future: on the one side, a loosely compacted congeries of religious societies, with no corporate mind except that individual members may be of what mind they please; on the other, a reunited phalanx of definite believers in the Incarnation, and in the Church as its extension and application.* Hence I

* "More and more does it seem likely that the alignment in future is to place in one camp the maintainers of the historic faith of the New Testament over against various forms of Unitarianism, which are likely more and more explicitly to

looked for Protestant federation on a basis of constitutional vagueness with recognition that Unitarians are its true apostles and pioneers, and was disposed to think that all Catholics and Catholic-minded people should merge lesser differences and combine under the leadership of Rome. Every indication that the Protestant Episcopal Church seemed headed in the Unitarian direction suggested the duty of reconsidering one's attitude toward the Apostolic See. I scrutinized the "difficulties" afresh, found that they all seemed less formidable, and that some had vanished. I cannot recall that in a single instance I knew at a definite moment that a special difficulty had been met. It was rather that from time to time something would suggest one of them, and I would see that it was gone. "They said, Who will roll us away the stone from the door of the sepulchre? And they looked, and behold the stone *was* rolled away." It was the result of subconscious, rather than conscious, thought of things. I cannot recall, either that, except on some matters of minor detail, I have learned new arguments, or been specially influenced by any person or book: it is rather that for the first time I have felt the force of arguments long known, if knowledge may be affirmed of what one seems to understand the meaning, yet does not feel the force.

abandon the New Testament, recognizing that the miraculous element is everywhere interwoven in its tissue. If this be true, the future of Christianity will lie with that Communion which can best vindicate its claim to represent the religion of the New Testament, that is, Christianity according to the apostolic norm." *Anglicanism,* p. 85.

Some arguments I have long known, chiefly *a priori*, make no impression on me whatever, as they seem to do on others.

The chief difficulties were historical, and these such as seemed to relate to the Early Church and to the Eastern Churches, rather than to the Church of England. Greatest of all was the claim made for the Papacy. Once this could be accepted, "Rome" would be recognized as the Catholic Church; and the one practical duty was simple obedience.

1. My belief was that History showed the Papacy to be a purely ecclesiastical development; due to the greatness of the Imperial City, to the Apostolic traditions of the See, to its consistently good record, to a combination of political conditions which forced it into prominence, and, quite subordinately, to the ambition of certain Popes. Most of its greatness seemed to have been thrust upon it by needs of the Church. Yet it was merely a patriarchate inflated by feudalism, eminently useful in many ways in the Middle Ages, but corresponding to nothing in the Divine constitution of the Church. Its claim to be this had been the great cause of disunion between East and West. This view was due to failure to see constitutional significance in Our Lord's words to St. Peter and to the comparative lateness of emphatic assertions of the Petrine claim. I recognized that from the fifth century on, it had been made with increasing clearness and gradually wider recognition: I was disposed latterly to date it back to the beginning of the fourth century as something dimly acknowledged by the Church: and I knew

that in Rome itself belief in the primacy as Petrine, not merely Roman, was attested for the late third century. I was convinced that mediæval and modern pretensions of the Papacy were clearly disproved by the history of the early Roman Church itself.

The following passages from my History textbook indicate my understanding of the facts.

"The Church of Rome was always the most powerful Church in Christendom; but its early precedence in honor and influence fell far short of the developments of mediæval and modern times. The primacy of honor held by the Roman Church is one thing; the monarchical supremacy of the Roman Bishop is another. It is the last which constitutes the essence of the papal claim. . . . There is no question of the existence of the claim, and of increasing acquiescence in it, from the fifth century onward. There is no unmistakable proof of it at an earlier date, though it does not follow that it did not exist. The first indisputable evidence connects it with Innocent I (401-417); but it is not only possible, but probable, that it was inherited, rather than invented, by him. The evidence seems to show its absence from the minds of Roman Bishops down to the middle of the fourth century; yet some of the late fourth century Bishops may have entertained it, especially Damasus I (366-384)."

"Roman Catholicism combines the ideas of Romanism, the synonym of Empire, and of Catholicism, belief in the world-wide Church. In the successive aspects of papal history, there is quite as much of Julius Cæsar as of St. Peter. In theory, the association of Church and State was intended to spiritualize the State; as matter of fact, the effect has too often been to secularize the Church."

" Rome was Capital City of the Mediterranean world, the centre and source of political authority. Its Church had always been the most powerful in the western half of the Empire, and also, more than any other one Church, influential everywhere. Its greatness was also due to its excellent record and its apostolic associations. It had always recalled its early connection with the great Apostles, St. Peter and St. Paul, and from the third century emphasized its connection with St. Peter whose 'chair' the Roman Bishops occupied. But the theory that St. Peter and after him the Roman Bishops were in a unique sense Vicars of Christ does not clearly emerge until the fifth century."

" The beginning of definite papal claims must be assumed for a time near the episcopate of Damasus; but circumstances paving the way for it are to be found earlier still. It is not unreasonable to connect the origin of papal thoughts with Constantine's gift to Melchiades of the Lateran Palace, property of the family of the murdered Empress Fausta. . . . The Kingdom of this World was seeking the favor of the Kingdom of Christ. Inevitably the great thought came that Christ had conquered Cæsar, and that Cæsar's realms must henceforth be ruled in the Name of Christ. Rome again should rule the world, but now in behalf of God: it was still to be ruling City, but as Capital of God's Kingdom. Such an ambition for the Roman Church and Roman Bishops was natural and noble. The trouble was that in the event the spirit of Christ affected the Empire less than the spirit of Cæsar dominated the Church. The change in the Constantinian age must be taken into account in estimating the causes of the Papacy; there was solid ground for the stress laid centuries later on the forged 'Donation of Constantine.' . . .

" Quite apart from the greatness of the Roman Church as Church of the Capital, there were features in its record

which gave moral and ecclesiastical pre-eminence. During the first three centuries no other Church had so consistent a record for orthodoxy and good works. Rome had always been staunchly loyal to the faith, and had been the natural centre of the Church's chief philanthropies. Moreover, no other Church had so rich an apostolic heritage. Many eastern Churches had apostolic associations, and could claim to preserve intact apostolic traditions. Ephesus, for example, claimed a monopoly of St. John. But Rome traced its beginnings to the two chief Apostles, both of whom, as martyrs, had 'watered it with their blood.' Over their graves Constantine built the finest of the early basilicas. Rome was the Apostolic See, not only as the only see in the West having apostolic founders, but as having a memory of apostolic martyrs without parallel in Christendom. The traces of early art in the catacombs show how constantly the Roman Christians were thinking of their special connection with St. Peter and St. Paul."

"Controversialists have tried to throw doubt on the connection of the great Apostles, especially St. Peter, with Rome, and to do so have ignored a great body of evidence. At present no scholar of eminence undertakes to dispute the validity of this. We do not know details of the work of St. Peter and St. Paul in the Capital; but both died martyrs under Nero. . . . Of St. Peter we know nothing clearly except the circumstances of his death. Tradition speaks of a connexion of twenty-five years. It is possible that that period elapsed between his first arrival and his death; but he was almost certainly not in Rome for the whole of the time; nor was he regarded as head of the Roman Church when St. Paul wrote to the Romans about the year 56. From this Epistle to the Romans we learn the names of many Christians then in Rome, representing apparently all parts of the Empire. It was inevitable that there should

be many in the great central City, arriving singly or in small groups, joining others of their faith, gradually coming to know of other sets of Christians, finally coalescing in one Roman Church. Who was the first follower of Our Lord to set foot in the pagan Capital we do not know. 'Christianity was self-sown in Rome.' There were numbers twenty-five years after the Crucifixion and Resurrection; the first probably came very soon after those events." *

I was never in the least unwilling to see evidence for Petrine primacy, merely concerned to recognize no conception of primacy which the earliest evidence did not warrant. The chief fact that seemed to disprove the latter theories of this was the invariable coupling, in the few literary references to Roman beginnings which have survived the second century, of the names of St. Peter *and St. Paul.* Rome was Apostolic See from its having been founded by *two* Apostles: it seemed to have been foreign to the mind of the early Roman Church to think of St. Peter alone. This showed characteristic dependence on literary evidence only. The catacomb representations of St. Peter as Moses first made me see that this did not give the whole truth; and gradually I came to attach more importance to the evidence of local traditions and institutions after fuller study of De Rossi, Lanciani, and the books of Mgr. A. S. Barnes. These studies were going on in seminary days; but I did not see their full significance, owing doubtless to my belief that there was no Petrine primacy in Scripture.

I was not unwilling to see this, and had no patience

* *Outlines of Church History,* II: pp. 9 f, 19, 36, 146, 155.

with people who slurred over the Petrine texts. I myself habitually quoted and preached from them. Yet I was convinced that Our Lord's dealings with St. Peter, as leading Apostle and typical disciple, even when recognizing their uniqueness, had no bearing on the constitution of the Church. With the fixed idea of "the Twelve" as fundamental, I could see nothing essentially significant in the prominence of the One. Our Lord's special relation to St. Peter I paralleled with that to St. John. "Thou art Peter" was illustration of the fact that true discipleship is founded on faith in Our Lord's Divinity. Assuming parity among Apostles, in spite of the accidental prominence of a few of them, I went on to assume parity among Bishops, with no differences touching the constitution of the Church. What St. Peter was among Apostles, I recognized the Pope to be among Bishops: but I did not see that this was more than primacy of honor and influence. The Petrine claims I believed to be an afterthought.

It was only during the summer of 1918 that I saw more than this in the significance of the Petrine texts. I do not recall what led to this. I think it was recognition that Our Lord's commission of St. Peter is quite as formal as that of the Twelve; that, so far as the Gospels record, they are of parallel importance; and that it is just as reasonable to take the one set as part of the constitution and charter of the Church as the other. In any case, I can only bear my witness that, in daring to see special meaning for all time in Our Lord's dealing with St. Peter without

fear of controversial admissions, I have a sense of freedom in reading the Gospels I never had before. I have dropped fetters, not assumed them. I do not, however, as some do, find Petrine primacy in St. Paul's Epistles.

The *crux* of papal contention is, of course, the meaning of Our Lord's commission to St. Peter. If the Church *jure Divino* has a primacy in its apostolate, and a primacy therefore in its episcopate which perpetuates the apostolate, there are few or none who would question that this has existed in the Bishops of Rome. It has never been assumed that Rome usurped a primacy rightly established in Jerusalem or elsewhere. Granted a primacy, real not merely nominal, it must be conceded to the sole claimant, the Roman Papacy.

The evidence for the perpetuation of the primacy is analogous to that for the episcopate. The origins of the episcopate in Our Lord's choice and commission of the Twelve stand out in the clear light of Gospel testimony. By the last quarter of the second century, the episcopate is everywhere established, claiming to perpetuate the apostolate, and lasting unbroken to the present day. The evidence for it from this date is so full and irrefragable that it is futile to quibble at it. But for the intervening period of a century and a half the evidence is not so clear, but is sufficient. I think it was Bishop Gore who compared this to a tunnel, the darkness of which was broken by occasional lights, frequent enough to show that the apostolate of the Gospels and the episcopate of the age of Tertullian and

Irenæus are one in the principle and perpetuate Divinely-given authority in the Church. Those who reject the evidence of the "tunnel" period do so not because of its inherent weakness, but because of presuppositions that the apostolate represented nothing permanently essential to the Church.

So of the primacy. Its Gospel origins and its historical establishment at a certain date are in bright light: but there is a "tunnel" period for which the evidence is comparatively fragmentary. Yet it is quite sufficient except for those whose antecedent assumptions compel the rejection of all evidence whatsoever. As to the length of the tunnel there will be difference of opinion. Those who concentrate attention on Rome itself would consider it shorter than those who think more of general recognition without. It would seem to me that it does not terminate until the time of St. Cyprian; but I can see that many would not extend it beyond the pontificates of Eleutherus and Victor. That a "tunnel" period of some duration must be recognized would seem obvious either from the standpoint of scientific history or of effective apologetic. I have for many years been familiar with most details of this evidence without seeing their significance on account of my presuppositions, although I objected to too much explaining away of Victor and Stephen. It was to Batiffol's *Primitive Catholicism* that I owe chiefly the dropping of scales, especially for his comments on the significance of the controversy between Pope Stephen and St. Cyprian and St. Firmilian.

It is fair to recognize that special difficulty has been

created for students of papal history by tampering with the true evidence. Some of this has been due to uncritical, rather than to unscrupulous, copyists, who merely wished to add finishing touches to manuscripts; and it affects all history, not papal alone: but there have been also some deliberate falsifications. The great example is that of the Forged Decretals. They provided "corroborative detail intended to give artistic verisimilitude" to what seemed "an otherwise bald and unconvincing narrative," with the consequence that when their character of merely artistic detail was exposed, the impression left was that the true narrative was certainly unconvincing. They provided artificial light for the tunnel; and when its glare was extinguished, there was a sense of dense darkness in which dimmer natural lights were not visible. The fact of forgery seemed to prove the necessity of it, and hence that there was no genuine evidence at all. Those who in the ninth century fabricated and used this forgery were among the worst enemies the papal cause has ever had. Another example of the way in which the finishing touches of an editor may lessen, rather than accentuate, the force of his text is afforded by the interpolation in the *De Unitate* of St. Cyprian. Slight additions were made in the interests of Petrine primacy. The knowledge that this was done, calling special attention to these little things Cyprian did *not* say, actually distracts attention from the big things that he *did*. The evidence of the *De Unitate* is the most striking that comes from the early Church. Its effect is lessened for many who transfer to the whole a suspicion

which rightly attaches to added phrases of no great importance.*

The evidence for the early period is not so full as it becomes after the late third century: but it is sufficient to establish the principle of primacy, dimly exhibited and simply applied, but still continuous. It is closely parallel to that for the episcopate, as is natural, and has many analogies with that for the canon of Scripture. Those whose belief in the Papacy rests, as it normally should, on their experience of the living Church of which it is living Voice, are not troubled by Forged Decretals or anything that belongs merely to a dim and dusty past. They are naturally irritated by antiquarian fidgets. They see that "the appeal to History" is heresy when it signifies appeal from the Living Church to a Church long dead: but they must also see that the appeal to History is an act of faith, when it signifies confidence that the Church is always the same, applying the faith once delivered to varying needs in varying ways, one in principle though manifold in application.

The evidence for the episcopate and for the primacy are also parallel in that what is continuous is the fact and principle, not the details in application. It is in this sense, and this only, that the Vatican Definition speaks of the "sure and constant witness of every age." This is another way of speaking of "development." It is often asserted that the decrees of 1870 forbade recognition of this, making it impossible, for example,

* I have read the arguments aiming to prove that the interpolations are also Cyprianic, but am not convinced by them.

to hold such a theory as satisfied Newman in 1845. This is a mistake. Catholic writers, dealing with all aspects of the Church's life, see development in one form or another, continuous principles changing their outward form through the number, variety, and completeness of successive applications. With all insistence on the completeness of revelation and on the identity and continuity of principles underlying the life of the Church, there is full recognition of development both in faith and morals, by way of fuller apprehension of the content of revelation, and of more perfect application of it in practical detail.

So of the primacy. What was Divinely ordered in the constitution of the Church, by special commission of the "first" among Apostles, was perpetuated in the Church by the line of those recognized as first among Bishops. Many opposed and criticized individual Popes and censured them for misuse of authority; but none questioned their first place. Whatever be the source of the assertion, wrongly attributed in the fifth century to the Nicene Canons, the fact is indisputable, *Ecclesia Romana semper habuit principatum.* This *principatus*, by whatever name it is called, passed through many phases and stages, paternal, patriarchal, feudal, regal, imperial. For great stretches of history it was deep-dyed with murky shades of secular ambition and politics. In this it reflected the experiences of the Church as a whole, and of the episcopate in particular. But, from beginning to end, the principle of spiritual primacy has been the one safeguard of the Church's unity and independence.

Infallibility is simply an application of this. If the Pope holds highest authority in the Church, his official decisions represent the last word in controversy. Ultimate decision must rest somewhere: and those who believe in the infallibility of the Church, and in the primacy as integral to the Church, can have no difficulties over Papal Infallibility. As defined by the Vatican dogma, this is strictly limited and constitutional, applying only to questions of Faith and Morals, when the Pope speaks as Shepherd and Doctor for the Church. The discussions of 1870 emphasized quite as much the limitations of the Pope's primatial authority as the indisputable fact of it.

2. Two sets of considerations have made me a believer in the Papacy, the first historical, the second practical. The latter forced themselves into consideration through my experience as an Anglican Bishop. For over ten years, I have been trying to act as Bishop of the Catholic Church of God, and to relate my official duties to the ruling ideas of the episcopate as they appear in the writings of the Fathers. Of these, two stand out in chief prominence: the episcopate was guardian of the Faith, and it was the guarantee of unity. Matthias was chosen to be with the other Apostles a *witness;* similarly all Bishops are witnesses to the Risen Lord. Hence the solemn profession of faith at episcopal consecrations required by the Catholic ordinals. To ensure this, there must be authority to require loyalty to the Faith, and an authority to interpret it. There can be no loyal witness unrelated to a principle of authority behind the official witnesses. I have been led to think

of this, not as logical theory, but as practical necessity. As a Bishop, I wished to bear witness to the Faith, and tried to do so in various formal ways. I was free to do so in any way I saw fit. But there was a constant feeling of having "nothing behind"; that the utterances, no matter what their substance, were merely expressions of individual opinion. The Communion for which I was commissioned to act expected me to be loyal to the Faith only as not insisting on definite interpretations. Its articles must be treated as susceptible of various meanings, some of these contradictory. I believed in the literal Virgin Birth and literal Resurrection. I taught both, and that they were of essential importance. Yet I might equally well, as at least two of my episcopal brethren did with equal formality, have taught that the two doctrines were not to be literally accepted, or especially to be insisted on. Church custom backed this attitude rather than the other. The Anglican system provides no good working safeguard of loyalty in witness, as none so keenly as a Bishop can feel. Among Anglican Bishops most are orthodox as concerns historic interpretation of the Christological portions of the Creed, a few heretical, a great number hazy and indifferent. All can express their views, or lack of them, and may do so with vehemence: the majority may repeatedly adopt asseverations of devotion to the ancient Faith: but so far as the Church system goes, official teachers must be left to jog along, with no clear apprehension of dogmatic truth, no clear assertion of it, and nothing to clarify either apprehension or assertion. There is no ultimate authority to insist

on loyalty to the Faith once delivered. The historic episcopate was dogmatic in function, and intensely loyal in spirit: the Anglican episcopate, also loyal in spirit, is locally adapted by systems, political in England, congregational in America, into an undogmatic attitude, the actual influence of which is anti-dogmatic. Without a basis and background of cogent authority, the episcopate cannot function as witness to the Faith. In theory, the devotion of conscience to Our Lord may provide this: in the practical working system of the visible Church, something more is necessary.

Study of history always made me see clearly that in the See of Rome there had been the clearest loyalty to the Incarnation, an actual perpetuation of the faith of St. Peter, although I attached no theoretical importance to it. This I had in mind in saying in 1915: "The Bishop of New York (Dr. Greer) is reported to have said in an address at Cooper Union, 'The great secret of the influence of the Roman Church is its consistent witness to the supernatural.' This is certainly true. In these days of drift away from the supernatural, which means from religion, how thankful must we be to the Roman Church for its exhibition of Petrine loyalty to the fundamental Christian truth. How encouraging to feel certain that the authoritative force of half-Christendom will be steadily on the side of religion as a fact of Divine Revelation rather than of mere individual discovery."* Before accepting the principle exhibited, I recognized the fact that the

* *Issues before the Church,* p. 32.

Papacy has been the chief *Fidei Defensor*.* I could see that as matter of fact the Papacy discharged a function in regard to the Roman Catholic episcopate, for which the Anglican Churches had no substitute. Whether in theory, King, Parliament, General Convention, or House of Bishops, were expected to do it, they did not in fact. Hence the sense of the practical necessity of something like the Papacy to enable the episcopate to discharge its proper functions predisposed me to look more favorably upon its claims. (I am not here trying to suggest the answer to the question, *Quis custodiet custodientium custodem?*) Experience has shown that in actual practice neither Royal Supremacy or General Convention has been a satisfactory substitute for a Pope. Anglican Bishops all may, and a few do, drift from the Faith: and this must be so long as there is a hydra-headed hierarchy. The matter reduces itself to one of authority inherent in the priesthood—Sacrament of Orders. The Papacy merely focuses an authoritative priesthood. Belief in priests makes possible belief in the Pope: rejection of the Pope usually, though not always, involves rejection of any real belief in priests. The feeling here expressed does not indicate craving for authority as such, but rather a practical sense that central and ultimate authority is necessary to safeguard teaching and tradition of the Faith.

* I once heard the remark: "It seems to me that the Archbishop of Canterbury must be right in his politics, but he may believe as much or little as he pleases, more conveniently little: but the Pope may be a perfect fool in his politics, but he simply must not monkey with the Faith."

3. The episcopate is not only Divinely-established guardian of the Faith but also the bond and guarantee of Unity. Our Lord chose and commissioned Twelve Apostles, who were to sit on twelve thrones: but He did not thereby inaugurate twelve Churches.* The Apostolate was to be a united Apostolate, the foundation of One Apostolic Church; and through the unity of its governing College, all those admitted into the Church by Apostles were through them in unity with each other as well as with the Church's Divine Head. The Apostolate bound them together and guaranteed the permanence of their union.

So of the Episcopate, the extension of the Apostolate in time and territory. The Episcopate is essentially a united Episcopate, one, and the means of creating and preserving oneness among believers. The Apostles were severally and equally commissioned by Christ for the first order of ministry in His Church: so are Bishops. Yet individuality of commission involves no isolation in administration, in such a sense that the Church should be composed of disconnected dioceses and provinces in water-tight compartments, making each individual Bishop possible nucleus of schism.† The Episcopate is one, a united Episcopate,

* As St. Optatus comments (*Cont. Parm.*, II: 6), "In a single Chair unity was to be observed by all, so that the rest of the Apostles should not each maintain a chair to themselves; and that forthwith he should be a schismatic and a sinner who against that singular Chair set up another."

† Any belief in Episcopacy makes the diocese the administrative unit, the Bishop the centre of diocesan unity. Protestantism in all its forms abandons this, making the congregation the practical unit with parochial clergy as centres

not a collection of Episcopal units. If it ceases to preserve Catholic unity, it ceases to function as Episcopate in the historic sense.

As matter of fact, the oneness of the Episcopate has been secured through a Primacy. This is the point of the famous passage in St. Cyprian's treatise on Unity. "Upon Peter, being one, He builds His Church; and though He gives to all the Apostles equal power . . . yet in order to manifest unity, He has by His own authority so placed the source of the same unity, as to begin from one. Certainly the other Apostles also were what Peter was, endued with an equal fellowship both of honor and power; but a commencement is made from unity, that the Church may be set before us as one. . . . He who holds not this unity of the Church, does he think he holds the faith? He who strives against and resists the Church, is he assured that he is in the Church? For the blessed Apostle Paul teaches the same thing, and manifests the sacrament of unity speaking of One Body and One Spirit. . . . This unity firmly should we hold and maintain, especially we Bishops, presiding in the Church, in order that we approve the Episcopate itself to be one and undivided. Let no one deceive the Brotherhood by falsehood; no one corrupt the truth of our faith by a faithless treachery. The Episcopate is one; it is a whole, in which each enjoys full possession." *

of congregational unity. Where Bishops are superimposed on this system, they are mere bumble-bees, flitting from one parochial flower-bed to another, extracting pollen for diocesan missions, and incidentally promoting cross-fertilization!

* St. Cyprian, *De Unitate*, 4 f.

Belief in the unifying function of the episcopate compels belief in a unifying force in the episcopate; and hence establishes antecedent probability of such an institution in the Church as, in fact, has existed in the Papacy seated at Rome. The ancient Church knew of autocephalous Churches, like that of Cyprus, falling outside the ordinary groupings into patriarchates: but it knew nothing of diocesan or provincial isolation. Anything resembling the sixteenth century excursion of the provinces of Canterbury and York would not have been regarded as a phenomenon compatible with Catholic unity, but would have been promptly denominated schism.

Unity is dependent on something that represents centre. It cannot be created by agitated fragments of a circumference: it must issue from a central force and be sustained by centripetal instinct. There must be a centre of unity for the Church, visible centre for visible unity; there being no greater difficulty in believing in a primate as personal centre for the episcopate, than in a bishop as personal centre for his diocese, or a priest as personal centre for his parish. The recognition of *persona ecclesiae* in the lower senses paves the way for recognition of the supreme example of it. Common sense may suggest what must be, if the visible unity of the Church is to be preserved: history shows what has been. The Roman Papacy has been the actual centre of the most obvious visible unity the Church has ever possessed; and attempts to preserve this on the basis of a non-papal episcopate have in various ways proved failures. Rejection of the Papacy has invaria-

bly associated itself with principles ultimately destructive of all unity in, and with, the Church. It is not possible to elaborate this point. I have chiefly in mind the results in the East and in England of subjection of the Church to civil authority. My present object is merely to put myself on record as having come to hold what had no place in my earlier belief and teaching, and to emphasize that the conviction springs from ten years effort to do the work of a Bishop of the Church of God with the constant sense of "nothing behind."

A Catholic Bishop should be filled with an intense consciousness of the unity of the Order to which he belongs, and of the unity of the Catholic Church, in which, through his office, the people of his diocese are held. It represents an instinctive hold on sacramental principle. An Anglican Bishop cannot have this. The Bishops of the Episcopal Church were the finest and most delightful set of men I have ever known, or expect to know: so far as personal respect and affection could create bonds, there exists among them a unity of mutual respect and good fellowship. They can co-operate in all sorts of good works and combine for effective denominational activities. They accomplish a most creditable quantity of work in the triennial fortnights of hustle known as General Convention. They are effective associates in their own House and in the Lambeth Conferences every ten years with all Bishops of the Anglican Communion. But this is not to experience the sacramental fellowship of which St. Cyprian writes or to share the consciousness of what their Order means known to Eastern and Roman Bishops. With the ex-

ception of certain inner groups, their association is more like that of a club of typical American citizens, determined to help along every sort of good work. I was forcibly struck with what is lacking in such episcopal experience as I knew in reading the sermon and addresses on the meaning of the *pallium* delivered on the occasion of the investiture of Archbishop Dougherty of Philadelphia.

I thought also much of what was signified by the only ecclesiastical unity in the world at large possible for Episcopalians of Delaware. Their loose association with Episcopalians elsewhere, especially in frequent conventions; the right to communicate in Episcopal churches in all parts of the British Empire; membership in a Communion constituting about a fourteenth part of the Christian world, counts for much, and tends to break down the narrowing prejudices of mere parochialism. Yet it is not the same as the sense of sacramental brotherhood known to the ancient Church, and obviously possessed by Roman Catholics everywhere. The difference in the sense of what Church unity is and gives is not to be measured numerically but intrinsically. I thought of these things first in comparing the practical advantages offered respectively by separated portions of the Catholic Episcopate, conceived of as slit into three lines. I now see that the One Episcopate centred about the Apostolic See, the swarm about the queen-bee, is one thing, the Episcopates of the separated Churches, even when perfectly valid, quite another.

The Papacy, with all the faults in successive holders,

with all the admixture of sordid ambitions, utter worldliness, and despicable intrigue which have disfigured parts of its history, has nevertheless stood chiefly for the unity of the Church; and care for unity has been a leading cause of papal aggrandizement. As Duchesne comments, "Centralization is the organization of unity; it is also its safeguard." * In the preface to this book he also comments, "La centralisation ecclésiastique, on ne saurait le dire trop haut, n'est pas un idéal, mais un moyen."

4. The historical evidence which seemed to me most plainly subversive of papal pretensions was that of the Canons of the Councils of Nicæa, Constantinople, and Chalcedon. The sixth canon of the first seemed to place Roman jurisdiction in Italy on a par with that of Alexandria in Egypt and of Antioch in the Oriental Diocese: the third canon of the second gave the Bishop of Constantinople precedence after the Roman Bishop, "because Constantinople was New Rome," seeming to imply that secular greatness was the ground for ecclesiastical primacy in Old Rome: the famous twenty-eighth canon of the last of these Councils asserted this in set terms. That General Councils should have pronounced this judgment was to my mind final, Roman refusals to accept these canons notwithstanding. With

* Duchesne theorizes little about papal primacy, although providing materials from which right deductions may be made, especially in his monumental edition of *Liber Pontificalis;* but he has an admirable paragraph on papal development in the end of the first chapter, on the Church of England, in *Églises Séparées.* "Il serait trop long d'entrer ici dans l'histoire, même la plus sommaire, de cette centralisation.

many others, I attached slight importance to papal witness to papal pretensions, although I had no sympathy with Presbyterians who refused to accept the testimony of bishops as to episcopacy, or with the Independents who rejected Presbyterian notions of Scriptural polity because "presbyter was priest writ large." Yet I always gave respectful heed to the claims made by some very great Popes, especially Leo I, whose single-minded zeal for revealed truth and Christian unity was especially conspicuous. It was the reading of Allies' *Formation of Christendom* in 1918 which first opened my eyes to the fact that it was Constantinople, not Rome, which imported imperial and secular standards into the Church; and that in the fourth and fifth century contests it was Rome which was really standing for the supremacy of spiritual authority, for unity, and for ecclesiastical independence. It was conceivable that Rome was in the right, the canons of Councils domi-

Contentons-nous de constater que tout son développement se rattache aisèment aux origines, et que si, dans ses stades successifs, il offre de très grandes variations de forme et d'intensité, il s'inspire, en somme, des mêmes principes, tend vers le même but. Principes et but peuvent s'indiquer d'un mot: *Unum sint.* La centralisation est l'organisation de l'unité; elle en est aussi la sauvegarde. On à pu lui reprocher quelquefois d'être trop étroite, trop méticuleuse. Comme toutes les institutions de ce monde, elle est sujette aux abus et aux réformes. Si l'occasion se presente d'en faire la critique, on ne doit pas oublier les services essentiels qu'elle à rendus. On ne doit pas non plus lui subordonner les fins plus hautes qui sont sa raison d'être. L'unité est l'idéal de l'Église; c'est son premier trait dans le symbole: *Credo unam . . . Ecclesiam.* Qu'on y arrive par une voie ou par une autre, l'essentiel est d'y arriver; le devoir est de s'y maintenir."

nated by Constantinopolitan influence notwithstanding. I knew well enough the Roman estimate of "Byzantinism," but had never before felt the truth of it.

At the conference with the Greeks in New York, the Athenian Metropolitan spoke of the impossibility of joint action by Eastern Bishops until the governments of their respective countries should be at peace. He made evident the dependence of the Eastern Churches on political conditions and secular authority. It gave me a new view of Eastern "Erastianism" in spite of my having thought much of the position of the Church in Russia; and for the first time there flashed across my mind a vivid sense of the need of political independence of the central and controlling power in the Church. I saw there was much to be said for the temporal sovereignty of the Pope, something to which I was certain I should never attach importance, even if I ever came to admit that papal claims were synonymous with needs of the Church.

The Papacy stands for the principles not only of loyalty to the Faith and Unity of the Church, but also for spiritual independence. This I had seen in studying mediæval history, and had always been in sympathy with St. Anselm, St. Thomas of Canterbury, with the Popes in the investiture struggles, even with Gregory VII, and all other champions of moral and ecclesiastical freedom from secular aggression. I had thought often of the disadvantages of State control of the Church in England, and doubted whether the Anglicanism could survive disestablishment and dispossession. This made less impression, however, than apparent evi-

dences that the Eastern Churches are, and always have been, seriously crippled by dependence on the State, even outside the Turkish Empire. In their history was practical vindication of certain of the Roman contentions. I tried to be on guard against attaching too much importance to sudden impressions coming at a time when I knew I was in various ways rapidly Romanizing; but the *obiter dicta* of the Metropolitan of Athens seemed to precipitate knowledge of a variety of facts in the form of conclusion that, as between Rome and Constantinople, it was Rome who had championed ancient principle and the Church's independence; and that acts of General Councils which reflect Constantinopolitan ambition deserve to be regarded with the suspicion they always encountered in the West. This was a great blow to my prejudices, since I had long felt that, however weak the case for Cranmer and Henry VIII, the position of the Eastern Churches was strong, both in itself, and as the great confutation of the full papal claims as distinguished from patriarchal priority. The conference with the Greeks deepened my feeling of the attractiveness of the Easterns, of the pain of separation from them, of the duty of unity: but it left also the feeling that the basis of unity was not to be found in the vague and thoughtless desire of certain Anglicans "for us all just to get together just as we are" —to quote one of the American conferees—or, as I was disposed to assume, on approximately the Eastern basis of harking back to the Seventh General Council and St. John Damascene; but rather on the basis of recognition of one centre of visible unity in the Living Church,

on the principles enunciated, and in the spirit exhibited, by Leo XIII in his Encyclicals, *Praeclara* addressed to Easterns in 1894, and *Ad Anglos* in 1895. The various utterances of this worthy bearer of a great name are in line with the best things in Leonine tradition—*lumen de coelo.*

The sense of failures in the Anglican system, which came to me through episcopal experience, predisposed me to reconsider many things; and to consider favorably the papal system under which some of these failures seemed not to occur. The necessity of viewing things from unaccustomed angles gave new, and more practical estimates. Much against my will, I was driven to admit that a Bishop without a background of authority, compelling loyalty and comprising unity, is less than Bishop in the historic sense; and that episcopacy for discharge of its normal functions needs just such a background as, in fact, the papal system provides. This led to reinvestigation of historical problems with a willingness to revise old judgments, but with no disposition not fairly to face the facts. The result of this has been to leave the conviction that the papal claim is vindicated by Scripture and History; and that, in the controverted historical points, it is the Roman Catholic writers who, on the whole, are in the right, and who usually display preponderance, not only of logic, but also of learning and common sense.

CHAPTER XII

NEW DOGMAS: CULT OF SAINTS

To non-Catholics, especially those who believe in the visible Church, the Papacy is not only cause and chief example of schism, but also a great cause and protector of heresy. To Easterns, it represents the spirit of reckless innovation, to scholarly Anglicans, innovation and obsoleteness alike: to both, Latin Christianity seems self-condemned by having broken with traditions of government embodied in patriarchates, and of doctrine as expressed in patristic writers. "Back to the Fathers" involves "Away with Popes and Scholastics." Rome is regarded as *parvenu;* and its more recent doctrinal pronouncements must be viewed askance. This feeling is closely connected with deference to the supreme authority of General Councils, and belief in the impossibility of them since the separation of East and West. The characteristic Tractarian way of disposing of Rome and showing its errors is simply to say, "It was not so in the fourth century." This is analogous to the Protestant test, "It cannot be shown in Scripture."

This method with its characteristic conclusions has been wholly the one adopted by myself. For example, I was always disposed to an Eastern view of the *Filioque* on the ground, that it had been added to the creed by insufficient authority, and was not well chosen as a

theological term, yet never felt that it expressed heresy by imperilling the doctrine of the *monarchia* in view of the explanation by Western experts that it was used as equivalent to *per Filium*. I quite saw its use against Arians in Spain. Similarly, I had no objection to confession or the requirement of it, yet felt that compulsory auricular confession was *ipso facto* condemned by dating from the Council of Constance, and transcending the requirements of the Penitentiary Presbyters of Constantinople. Nor had I objection to the disciplinary requirement of clerical celibacy, in spite of Anglican incentives to matrimony, except in its Hildebrandine form. I believed in requiring it of Bishops, though not of Priests, since thus it had been in the fourth century and is in the East now.* Similarly of the cult of Saints. Such forms as could claim authority of the early centuries were to be favored, those of later date to be regarded with suspicion. So of Seven Sacraments. I believed in all of them, though

* Clerical celibacy created no obstacle in my way toward the Catholic Church. I believed in its desirability for many men, in spite of a very strong personal wish for marriage and a home and children of my own. Had I been free to do so, I should probably have married when I was younger; but I never should have done so as Bishop of Delaware. With the greatest admiration for the character and influence of good clerical homes, I never felt that married clergy could, on the whole, be as useful as unmarried, to say nothing of principles involved; and this tentative opinion has become conviction since I have come to know something of Catholic priests. On the subject of celibacy, there is nothing to be added to, or subtracted from, the words of Our Lord and St. Paul.

tardily in Extreme Unction; but objected to "Seven" as being a bit of definiteness dating only from the twelfth century, preferring no specific reference to number, or such indefinite extension as in the "thirty" of Adam of St. Victor. Anything merely mediæval was to be rejected as overdefinite, if it went beyond patristic precedent perpetuated in the East. One chief objection to "Rome" was its New Dogmas, especially the Dogma of the Immaculate Conception.

1. In regard to the Immaculate Conception itself, I believed that it should be recognized and propagated as pious opinion, but felt its promulgation as *de fide* indefensible, since it had not been held by St. Augustine—in regard to whom I was mistaken—or by St. Thomas Aquinas. My sensitiveness in regard to the latter was quite inconsistent, for, in spite of habitually holding him up as supreme example of consecrated intellect, I was disposed to place him with Peter Lombard on a sort of Index of overdefinite Saints and Doctors to be accepted *cum grano salis maximo*. I could not have hesitated to accept this, or any other dogma, promulgated by authority of the universal episcopate as I conceived it; but felt that it was not sufficient to have the Pope alone speak in behalf of the subservient Latin episcopate. Novel assumptions in regard to doctrine seemed to follow from a false conception of the Church. These objections fell to the ground the moment of recognizing the principle of primacy as inherent in the Church, and of communion with the Apostolic See as the one practical test of what constitutes the Catholic Episcopate. Acquiescence in this dogma follows from recognition of

these facts, cordial conviction of its importance from seeing its congruity with genuine belief in the Incarnation.

"To many 'Immaculate Conception' has seemed to imply that the Blessed Virgin did not die in Adam, that she did not come under the penalty of the fall, that she was not redeemed, that she was conceived in some way inconsistent with the verse of the *Miserere* psalm. . . . We hold nothing of this kind; we consider that in Adam she died, as others; that she was included, together with the whole race, in Adam's sentence; that she incurred his debt, as we do; but that, for the sake of Him Who was to redeem her and us upon the Cross, to her the debt was remitted by anticipation, on her the sentence was not carried out, except indeed as regards her natural death, for she died when her time came, as others. All this we teach, but we deny that she had original sin; for by original sin we mean something negative, viz. this only, the *deprivation* of that supernatural unmerited grace which Adam and Eve had on their first formation,—deprivation and the consequences of deprivation. Mary could not merit, any more than they, the restoration of that grace; but it was restored to her by God's free bounty, from the very first moment of her existence, and thereby, in fact, she never came under the original curse, which consisted in the loss of it. And she had this special privilege, in order to fit her to become the Mother of her and our Redeemer, to fit her mentally, spiritually for it; so that, by the aid of the first grace, she might so grow in grace, that, when the Angel came and her Lord was at hand, she might be 'full of grace,' prepared, as far as a creature could be prepared, to receive Him into her bosom." *

* Newman: *Difficulties of Anglicans*, Letter to Pusey, Section 3.

The dogma is to be accepted, not only in submission to the authority of the Church, but pre-eminently for its safeguarding the truth of the uniqueness of Our Lady's life. None who believes that her Son was God, and hence can marvel at her place in the scheme of human redemption, can fail to see that her birth, her death, and her entrance into Heaven, must be thought of as unique events.

Consideration of what is involved in accepting new definitions in matters of faith led me to think more of the content of belief in the Living Church on which I was always insisting in sermons and charges. The Living Church, as corollary on belief in the Living Lord, I accepted; but failed to appreciate in how many ways the Church lives, and never took in definitely that Living Church involves Living Voice. My own method of applying the "appeal to antiquity," which I regarded as of the genius of Anglicanism, was a "harking back to the past ages and irrevocable conditions on the theory that we can let some bygones be bygones, if we take other bygones for beginnings," which I condemned in other people. Although I was ready to declare that "American religion of the future cannot be confined either in Greek cerements of the sixth century, or in Italian trammels and trappings of the thirteenth, or in English, Scottish, or German moulds of the sixteenth, or in nineteenth century ruts, even though they were formed in America," I assumed something of the sort all the time.*

Any retrospective theory of the Church is wrong as

* *Catholic and Protestant,* pp. 88, 116.

involving denial that the Church, and hence its Lord, is really Living. This is true of any appeal to Scripture, tradition, or history, which is not subordinate to, and merely corroborative of experience of the Lord now working with us and confirming His word by signs. The outstanding feature of Catholicism is its insistence on *the present*. I was groping after this when I said in a Charge in 1916: "The chief characteristic of the life of the Church is the vivid sense of Our Lord's near presence and constant activity, a vivid sense of the unseen world and of its throngs of obedient hosts. Those whose 'life is hid with Christ in God' are companions of 'angels and archangels and all the company of Heaven' in God's worship and God's service. The Good Shepherd is in the midst of His flock, knowing and known. 'The love of Jesus, what it is, none but His loved ones know.' Especially are they conscious of this as the Good Shepherd feeds His flock mystically with 'the true Bread which comes down from Heaven' in the Holy Eucharist." Faith has to do with present spiritual relations; and what was true in the past only concerns us because of its bearing on what is true now. The falsity of non-Catholicism in its various forms is shown by any reference for standards to a remote and obscure past, in Protestantism, by its obvious gravitation toward Old Testament levels, and in pseudo-Catholicism, by tendencies to antiquarian petrification. Where there is vivid sense of present spiritual realities, there is vivid Catholic instinct, no matter by what name it calls itself. But any rallying-cry of "Back to" is dangerous, even of "Back to Christ," for this is meaningless unless it is

synonymous with "Up to, and down before, Christ." New dogmatic pronouncements must be related not only to the mode of utterance provided for the Church, but also to the whole conception of the Church's constant vitality.

2. The sort of objection above indicated is the only sort felt by many High Anglicans to Transubstantiation. Believing in the Real Presence, and that denial of this is pernicious error, they reject Transubstantiation in the first place, because Anglican clergy are *ex officio* bound to do so; and, in the second, because Anglican divines maintain that the scholastic doctrine attempts to explain the inexplicable; gives details as to mode where all that matters is the fact; and involves obsolete and misleading metaphysics, which plunge into dangers of "Eucharistic Nihilianism." Chalcedonian prejudice is easily alarmed at suggestion of sacramental Eutychians. Hence, in company with many, I rejected Transubstantiation only on the ground that its metaphysics, in strict technicality, involved denial of "the outward part or sign" in such wise as to "overthrow the nature of a Sacrament." From reading I knew that most, if not all, Roman theologians so taught about the "accidents" as to safeguard the doctrine, and believed that the technical interpretation which Anglicans rejected was one that they would reject too. I saw also that High Church Anglicans, though committed to rejection of the doctrine, were put to some difficulty to make out a convincing case and were somewhat artificial in their official polemic zeal.

It is some years since I came to feel that Transub-

stantiation is nothing but unqualified assertion of the Real Presence; and that this is the ground of objection to it in nine cases out of ten. Nor could I become excited over dangers apparently not felt by theologians and pastors who had most practical experience of its effects. Devout congregations at Mass did not seem like Eucharistic Nihilists; simply believers of the sort I had always best known, only better able to put their faith into practice, and in possession of a "joy and peace in believing" not possible for the equally believing and devout Anglicans, who were quite regular at "early service." At most, objection to Transubstantiation was objection to a term as not best chosen. Criticism of its metaphysics was precisely like that to which ὁμοούσιον was subjected. Experts assert that fourth century metaphysics are out of date; that its terms are susceptible of misleading suggestions; that modern metaphysics could provide better terms for the Creed. Yet this occasioned no difficulty. St. Athanasius, not at all a stickler for words, would have accepted any effective substitute for the Nicene watchword, yet defended it as used in the Creed as an unequivocal assertion of the co-equal Divinity of God the Son. That and that alone was what it stood for; and that is what it stands for in the Creed now. Hence it may be used and valued, no matter what one thinks, or whether one thinks anything at all, of the comparative excellence of fourth century metaphysics. Human philosophy and its fashions count for nothing in comparison with the expression of Divine truth. Old-fashioned metaphysics, of the fourth or any other century, are good

enough for the purpose, if they leave no doubt as to the truth of revelation they are used to express. So of *θεοτόκος*. The term has been, and is, criticized as not the best: but it cannot be objected to by any who recognize its essential meaning, of asserting the unique eminence of the Virgin Mother in the minds and hearts of those who believe in the Deity of her Son.

So of Transubstantiation. Its mediæval metaphysics may have been for some superseded by modern substitutes, as these in time will doubtless be by others: yet these changes in thought and language do not affect the miracle of the Mass. It is this which the scholastic term asserts, as is well understood both by those who believe, and by the majority of those who reject it. The meaning of the term is simply that the bread and wine in the Eucharist become by consecration the Body and Blood of Christ. Those who believe this must hail the term, as well as the doctrine, for its past as well as present influence; those who do not believe it, must disparage the term because they hate the thing implied. In this matter of plain choice there is no place for overfastidiousness in linguistic precision, no real use between light and darkness for the obscurities pleasing to timid souls, no ground for satisfaction when "Eleusis hints but does not speak." The significance of Transubstantiation is simply Real Presence in the full significance conveyed by both words. Those who believe the truth cannot quibble over the word.

3. In regard to Transubstantiation, the chief difficulty of many Anglicans is to be satisfied that there is sufficient ground for its repudiation in their Article

XXVIII. They regret that on this point there should be difference between the English Church and the Roman and have an uneasy suspicion that Rome may not be so far wrong after all. Not so in regard to the administration of Communion in one kind. The withholding of the Chalice from the laity seems to be Rome's most obvious fault, direct disobedience to a Divine command. "Drink ye *all* of this" is explicit. Of all "Roman difficulties" this ought to be to persons with presuppositions such as mine the most insuperable. It used to seem so. Although the doctrine of concomitance could be accepted, to administer in one kind only seemed to defy Our Lord's direction at the Institution, as interpreted by all liturgical tradition. I have recently tried to lash myself into a state of consistent protest; and the attempt has failed. This is due partly to dawning recognition of the rightful authority of, and in, the Church, with a consequent cessation of assumption that all things must be settled at the tribunal of private judgment: more, I think, to experience in diocesan work of the apparently insuperable difficulties in many places of reverent administration. Knowledge of these, of the simplification of various practical problems by administration under the species of bread only, gave a sense of what lies behind the modern rule of discipline. Moreover, it is impossible not to see that Calixtines, either Bohemian Hussites or their later successors, have not been actuated by motives of special reverence for Our Lord's Blood and longing for greater mystical blessings; but by opposition to the Mass as mystery and by desire to combat clerical authority and privilege,

"the priesthood of the laity" often being alleged as virtual assertion of the non-priesthood of the clergy. Those who are supremely devoted to Our Lord as revealed through the Eucharist, do not quarrel with the decree of Constance. What was once a great "difficulty" for me has for some time ceased to be troublesome.

4. There was no stumbling-block in the doctrine of Purgatory. The truth as expressed in the Tridentine definition, "There is a Purgatory; and souls detained therein are helped by the suffrages of the faithful, but principally by the acceptable Sacrifice of the Altar," I never questioned. To lurid and graphic details of description, derived from visions of Gregory the Great and sundry ascetics, I paid no heed: the essential thing was the fact and principle enunciated by the Council of Trent, Augustinian in its simplicity, and merely expressing what was implied in the teaching of those to whom I habitually deferred. The simple recognition of a process of purification and growth for imperfect souls after death accords with what I have believed and taught ever since I have thought of such things. I frequently quoted from the *Dream of Gerontius*, especially on Good Friday in preaching at the Three Hours on the Word to the penitent thief.

> "There is a pleading in His pensive eyes
> Will pierce thee to the quick and trouble thee.
> And thou wilt hate and loathe thyself; for, though
> Now sinless, thou wilt feel that thou hast sinned,
> As never thou didst feel; and wilt desire

To slink away and hide thee from His sight.
And yet wilt thou have longing aye to dwell
Within the beauty of His countenance.
And these two pains, so counter and so keen,—
The longing for Him, when thou seest Him not,
The shame of self at thought of seeing Him,—
Will be thy veriest, sharpest purgatory."

"The eager spirit has darted from my hold,
And, with the intemperate energy of love,
Flies to the dear feet of Emmanuel,
But, ere it reach them, the keen sanctity,
Which with its effluence, like a glory, clothes
And circles round the Crucified, has seized
And scorched, and shrivelled it; and now it lies
Passive and still before the awful Throne.
O happy, suffering soul, for it is safe,
Consumed, yet quickened, by the glance of God." *

5. Yet there ought to be difficulty in Indulgences. Bishop Creighton once said, "I am reduced almost to

* I felt strongly on the subject of Prayers for the Dead, and that the Anglican Burial Office was inadequate to express the full Christian hope. The first time that I was deeply impressed with its unsatisfactoriness was at the funeral of the Reverend Doctor Charles Harris Hayes in Newark in 1910. All that the Church provided was used; but the effect as some one afterward commented was simply that of "unmitigated gloom." I had the same feeling at the funeral of the Reverend Doctor J. H. Eccleston in Baltimore. For years I never used the Burial Office without feeling that it was lamentably lacking. In 1914 I delivered a Charge to the Delaware Clergy, one section of which dealt with Prayers for the Dead. This was separately published, and translated into Japanese by a former pupil, the Reverend Y. Inagaki.

idiocy by attempting to understand the mediæval doctrine about Indulgences. Let me commend it to you when you feel in a lazy mood; it will turn your hair gray if anything will." I have never been reduced to idiocy by this particular process, nor has my hair been affected by it. Not that I wholly understand Indulgences, or would undertake to explain them. I know no more of them now than I did twenty years ago, and am as puzzled by certain aspects of them as I ever was. Yet I cannot keep myself out of the Church simply because of this failure to understand. In the actual life of Catholics little stress seems to be laid on them: they are simply incidental consequences of habits of devotion. I accept them because the Church sanctions and provides them, assuming that there must be good reason, whether I fathom it or not. This acquiescence is, I think, simply an act of faith. I am glad that it should be. In many other things, I have wished to understand the why and wherefore of everything, accepting the Church's judgment when it had the sanction of my own! In this matter, I do not see why, nor care to. *Roma locuta est.*

6. The charge of "idolatry" commonly directed against Catholicism is made to apply to "the idol of the Mass," but more often to the cult of the Saints, chiefly to fully developed "Mariolatry." In my own mind, this objection took the form of belief that the popular cult of local Saints in some parts of the world was merely a disguised form of pagan polytheism; and that the devotion paid to the Blessed Virgin, even when right in motive and unexceptionable in form, was in

actual practice given a disproportionate importance and tended to obscure the worship of Our Lord. I believe that among ignorant people in some places both these things are true; yet I cannot find a single instance of authoritative sanction for them, nor any official teaching on the honor due to the Saints, which does not guard against possible abuses and carefully distinguish between this and the adoration due to God only. "Their prayers are invoked, not they." If Catholics lapse into an idolatrous, or semi-idolatrous, attitude toward the Blessed Virgin or any of the Saints, it is in spite of warnings which all have received. If this devotion becomes worship, it is idolatry; if it crowds out worship of God, it is misused: all failures to give God His due first place are breaches of the First Commandment. All Catholic catechisms, Eastern as well as Western, emphasize this. That there have been, and are, failures to heed these warnings is indisputable, as is attested by several great saints: but the Church cannot be held responsible for ignorance and disobedience which its authorized teaching seeks to prevent. No one with instincts of reverence for the heroes of the faith, or any sense of the Christian consciousness of the unseen world, can find difficulty in the teaching of the Council of Trent: but for many difficulty is created by popular abuses of which they have crudely exaggerated notions.

There can be only high praise for the motive of much objection of this sort, since it springs from loyalty to Our Lord and a passionate jealousy for His rightful prerogatives. That expresses the fundamental Chris-

tian instinct of which non-Catholic Evangelicals possess no monopoly. One great example of its effective expression is to be found in the cult of the Sacred Heart, the sense of Our Lord's burning love for human souls, evoking from them most passionate devotion. When from this motive there is suspicion of possible encroachment on the part of Saints, it is enough to point to the distinction between veneration and worship; and that it is loyalty to Our Lord which involves veneration for all nearest to Him. In many instances, however, distrust of the Saints is due to coldness of heart, and measures incapacity for genuine love of God.

Actual experience of Catholic customs will lessen, or remove, this difficulty in at least three ways. In the first place, to be understood the devotions paid to Saints must be viewed in their context of continuous worship of God through Our Lord. Their actual place, determined by the great fixed points of Catholic life and worship, is distinctly subordinate. This would be illustrated by the two examples of their commonest public use. After Mass, the great habitual act of worship of Our Lord Himself, lasting half an hour or longer, about three minutes are devoted to veneration of Our Lady in the *Ave Maria* and *Salve Regina* and petition for her intercession and that of other great Saints. To Catholics there is no parity whatever between the great Sacramental Sacrifice and the short office which follows its conclusion. Or in the evenings, the Rosary is publicly recited, a series of meditations on the mysteries of the Incarnation, to a sort of running accompaniment of the Angelic Salutation and invocation of

the Blessed Virgin, as it were basing all thought of the mysteries on the Incarnation itself practically realized in the Communion of Saints. But this is only prelude to the special devotion for which a congregation has assembled, the adoration of Our Lord in the service of Benediction. Nor can there seem to be disproportion in a blaze of tapers about a saint's image on some festival to those who know what in the church the High Altar signifies, and that the one really important light is that which indicates the Tabernacle. The Saints always and everywhere are nothing but Our Lord's retinue, and, even in case of the greatest, derive all their importance from Him.

In the second place, it is helpful to be reminded that those chiefly responsible for devotion to the Saints have been at greatest pains to safeguard them from abuse. It is, of course, the whole series of devotions to the Blessed Virgin which would be most likely to pass the line which separates veneration from worship. The careful relation of these to the worship due to Our Lord alone may be illustrated by reference to two names, specially identified in the minds of many with a tendency to make an idol of the Queen of Heaven, St. Alphonsus Liguori and Father Faber of the Oratory. One of the most frequently cited examples of gross "Mariolatry" is Liguori's *Glories of Mary*. Certainly it would seem that nothing could go beyond this in heaping titles of dignity and in assertions of humble dependence. If there is danger that excess of devotion to the Blessed Virgin should ever obscure the sense of Our Lord as the one Mediator between God and man, St. Alphonsus

would seem to incur it. Yet this is what St. Alphonsus says: "In the Catholic Church are found true love of God and of one's neighbor. The love of Jesus Christ ought really to be the chief and almost only devotion of a Catholic. To advance towards perfection, practice yourself above all things, in Divine love. If you want to go to Heaven, love God with all your heart." * Similarly Faber, the English convert chiefly identified with suspected popular devotions, whose constant references to "Dearest Mamma" palled upon his friends, as the author of some of the best-known hymns in honor of the Virgin, and as one whose lips constantly uttered her name, is often credited with giving special impetus to the "Mariolatrous" cult. Yet the substance of what he expresses would be indicated by such verses as these.

"How close to God, how full of God,
Dear Mother, must thou be!
For still the more we know of God,
The more we think of thee.

"This is thy gift—oh, give it us!—
To make God better known
Ah Mother! make Him in our hearts
More grand and more alone."

The extravagance of his praises of Our Lady in one set of hymns can only be understood by the humility of his prayers to Our Lord in another. What is true of these rather extreme "clients of Mary" is true in

* Liguori: *Truth of the Faith,* part iii, chapter I.

more marked degree of other teachers. Study of the development of Marian devotions will make it clear that, although Christian love must always bow before her as highest of creatures, there is no failure to recognize the gulf that separates even the highest of creatures from the Creator.

In the third place, it is necessary to distinguish between modes of expression and matter expressed. It touches no matter of principle that the language of devotion should be subject to criticism from the standpoint of taste. Much devotional language, not only panegyric and invocation of saints but sometimes also language used in prayer to God, is in form offensive to many people. I have seen much of it that I could not use, which seemed tawdry, cheap, unreal. With that conceit which is prone to hold its own canons of taste as standards for other people, I am disposed to assume that it would appear in the same way to all people of discernment. Yet there is, and ought to be, no one standard in matters of this sort. In the Catholic Church, as in the world, are all sorts of people, who must be provided for in ways best suited to their respective needs. It is not necessary to pass judgment on differences in method. The practical point is that the Catholic Church with maternal versatility provides what is useful for all her children; and none is bound to make use of forms of personal devotion other than those which commend themselves to individual preference. The general devotions used in public, and practically obligatory, are of a sort suitable for everybody, constituting a simple and stable foundation for cor-

porate worship on which each may erect such a superstructure of personal devotion as he pleases. Moreover, the language of penitent souls is not the proper object for the exercise of critical faculties.

It cannot be too often repeated, or too strongly emphasized, that devotion to the Saints is a consequence of, and in proportion to, devotion to Our Lord. Only believers in the Incarnation can have any sense of the unique privileges of the Blessed Virgin and of St. Joseph; and having this, must of necessity render their homage. To withhold it is to fail in due honor to Our Lord. No one who believes in Him as very God of very God, can fail to recognize the awful sanctity attaching to her who was His Virgin Mother, to him who guarded His childhood, and to all those admitted to His intimacy. The measure of sainthood is the degree of nearness to Him, and homage to those near Him is mere reflection of adoration of Himself. Dishonor to them, neglect of them, shows indifference to their and our Divine Lord.

Nor have we due sense of the solidarity of salvation, the corporate character of the method of redemption, if we fail to appreciate how the "cloud of witnesses" may help us. Only through the practice of invocation does the Communion of Saints come to have practical meaning and value. Yet in this is a great source of inspiration. There is magnificence in the thrilling thought that underlies the Litany of the Saints and the commemorations in the Mass, not only for poetical and historical souls, who have a special joy of their own, but more for lonely, humble, and troubled souls

who alone best know its value. In general is it true in all matters of this sort, that difficulties which obsess non-Catholic imaginations vanish on contact with Catholic practice.

CHAPTER XIII

JESUIT ETHICS

The chief stumbling-block in the way of favorable regard for Roman Catholicism for many people is not doctrinal but practical, supposed tampering not with Faith but with Morals. It is not that there are many impatient rigorists, prone to assume that they alone are champions of the Church's sanctity; it is not that reasonable people fail to recognize that human frailty is always interfering with Christianity's full effects, that sins are always to be discovered in the Church, that there have been, and always will be, bad priests, bad bishops, bad popes, as well as bad laymen: but there is suspicion that in the Roman Catholic system is something that tends along certain lines to lower moral standards, that the Church to further selfish ends sanctions reprehensible action; and the conscience of men is outraged by the thought that what purports to represent Divine justice should from motives of expediency palliate vice. The objection is felt from the standpoint of commonplace morality, rather than that of sanctity, and is very widespread. Many facts are cited to substantiate it, and the cautious assume that, where there is so much smoke, there must be some fire. They are not as ready as their fathers to believe evil; but they wish not to have plausible theories blind them to the significance of damning facts. What, they ask, of possible dangers from the Inquisition, of clerical extor-

tions, of wickedness in high places in times past, of the general suspicion of intrigue in the Curia, of the covering up of scandals, of the sanction of mental reservation so that it is impossible to know whether the word of Catholics can be trusted? It is felt that what is at the bottom of implied charges like these applies not to unworthy Churchmen here and there, but to the Church, in which they are not anomalies but "fruits." This suspicion and prejudice I have shared. It was to some sort of tampering with moral standards that I believed Tyrrell's remark about "drains out of order" referred, as well as the remark ascribed to a notable convert, that "if he had known before all he had come to know, he would not have made his submission." What truth lies behind the suggestion in "doctrinal rigor and easy morality"? To ask such questions implies no rigorist views, or failure to recognize that "we have our treasure in earthen vessels," but springs from conviction that the Church ought to be subjected to tests of severest scrutiny, since like Cæsar's wife she must be "above suspicion," and if unjustly maligned, must be defended from calumny.

For three years, I have tried to investigate the basis of this suspicion, existing, as I knew, in many minds, and never wholly absent from my own. The War revived it in raising questions about the policy of the Curia, the latest form of an old difficulty. It is usual to trace the trouble to the influence of Jesuit casuistry, both "Jesuitical" and "casuistical" being opprobrious epithets. Many who are disposed to revere the "White Pope" dread the "Black Pope," not thinking

the former Antichrist, or anything worse than a mediæval phenomenon imperfectly acquainted with his own history, but regarding as distinctly antichristian some activities supposed to be undertaken under auspices of the latter.

This was much my own case, and in wishing to know more of the moral influence of the Roman Catholic Church, I wished particularly to learn more of Jesuit casuistry. My first notions of the Jesuits were derived from Pascal; and although subsequent reading taught me many things not to be learned from his essays, I held to his view that the typical Jesuit stands for policy rather than for principle; and that in the past the Order has in unscrupulous ways sought to further its own interests and those of the Church. This view was strengthened by reading Sir James Stephen's essay on the *Founders of Jesuitism*, Ranke's *Popes*, Cartwright's *Jesuits*, and even Taunton's *Jesuits in England*.

It was not that I was without knowledge of their lofty ideals. When I was ordained priest in 1896 the Reverend Charles Wheeler Coit gave me his father's copy of *The Spiritual Exercises of St. Ignatius*, which I read carefully and tried to use. When a few years ago I read Franciosi's *Spirit of St. Ignatius*, I received no impression wholly different from what I had long since derived from use of the little book which had belonged to Dr. Coit.

I had also a great admiration for Jesuit missionaries, first derived from Parkman in 1895; and in lecturing on the History of Missions had one special lecture on the Jesuits as pre-eminently the missionary

heroes of the seventeenth century. On two different occasions, I urged the placing of a statue to Father Isaac Jogues, as the one great martyr in the annals of New York State, in the Cathedral of St. John the Divine; first in a series once proposed of representatives of American Christianity, and second in a series of representatives of French Christianity in the St. Martin's Chapel. In my Seminary lectures, I went into detail in giving the lives of St. Ignatius and St. Francis Xavier. Nevertheless I always prefaced my lectures by saying, "The Jesuits can only be described in superlatives. They represent all that is most devoted, and at the same time all that is most dangerous, in Roman Catholicism. Like Tennyson's little girl, 'when they are good, they are very, very good; and when they are bad, they are horrid.'"

The latter statement was due to two causes: first, that I had read the eighteenth century history of the Order chiefly in the accounts of opponents, and as between Jesuits and Popes opposed to them, invariably sided with the Popes; and second and chiefly, because I altogether distrusted the casuistry, of which I took my notions chiefly from Cartwright. He cited Jesuit authorities for his illustrations, and I verified enough of his quotations to feel that he could be trusted. His collection consisted entirely of the most doubtful opinions. I failed altogether to appreciate the character of the books on Moral Theology, dealing with difficult and exceptional cases of conscience, taking advice to confessors tending to encourage justice, as well as leniency, in sympathetic dealings with penitents exposed to pe-

culiar temptations, as advice to people in general tending to provide easy excuses for neglect of displeasing duties. I confused puzzling exceptions with normal examples, as was natural enough for one in utter ignorance of many things necessary for enabling one to estimate such things justly. I should now have a much fairer appreciation of the kind of work done by the early Jesuit doctors, and of their value as pioneers along some lines of moral theology: but my judgment of some of the special opinions cited by Cartwright is now precisely what it was when I first saw them. They are indefensible and tend to blunt moral perceptions. This would be the judgment of most people, especially by modern doctors of Moral Theology, among whom Jesuits are chief. In Jesuit books have I found the most sweeping condemnation of them and what they represent. It is to such opinions as these that I take it Father Slater S.J. refers, when he says:

"Casuistry is a word with rather bad connotation in the English language. Its secondary meaning, according to the *Century Dictionary,* is 'over-subtle and dishonest reasoning.' I am not concerned to deny that there may be good historical grounds for something of the evil reputation which the word possesses. It is apt to be associated in men's minds with the tortuous reasonings of the Scribes and Pharisees, with their exaggerations of lighter duties and their explaining away of the weightier matters of the law. Their desire to make the yoke of the moral law in certain places more easy for men's shoulders may also have its parallel among some Catholic theologians; not every Catholic theologian catches or represents the mind of the Church.

"Still, casuistry should not suffer for the sins and errors of some of those who have cultivated the science of conduct. Not all who profess themselves mathematicians or physicists write wisely about those branches of knowledge, and yet mathematics and physics are not held responsible for their vagaries. Neither should the great and useful science of casuistry suffer because some casuists have by their labors endangered the supremacy of the great moral law.

"It is difficult to see how any one who admits that there are moral laws or rules of conduct, can reasonably refuse to admit a science of casuistry. Anarchy and confusion would quickly prevail in a country where the interpretation of the laws was left to the judgment or caprice of private citizens." *

The false judgment of many people like myself concerning casuistry in general, as distinct from certain specific opinions, would be due to the assumption that the ultimate bar before which all moral questions must stand is that of individual private judgment. I am told that Father Slater is the most generally used authority on Moral Theology among English-speaking Catholics and is recognized as typical representative of Jesuit teaching. In studying some five volumes of his during the summer of 1918 I found the answer to every difficulty which ever possessed me concerning Jesuit ethics, and have found unqualified condemnation of everything which led me, on the assumption that it was traceable to the teaching of certain early Jesuit doctors, to think that in certain aspects his Order was "very, very horrid."

* Slater: *Questions of Moral Theology*, p. 176.

For example, nothing has been more disturbing than the supposed sanction of mental reservations, which made it impossible to know when truth was spoken. Instances are cited of the quoting of such as sanction for perjury. Nothing of this sort is to be found in Father Slater, who takes even a stricter stand than certain English writers, sometimes quoted by Anglicans, who make the essence of a lie chiefly to consist in its being spoken "to one who has a right to know." The only mental reservation sanctioned by Father Slater are the "wide" reservations, in regard to right to communicate knowledge, which must be made in the keeping of professional secrets, by lawyers and doctors, no less than by the priest in regard to what has come to him in the confessional. Yet even these "must not be employed without just cause, for the good of society requires that we speak our mind with frankness and sincerity in the sense in which we are understood by our hearers, unless there be a good reason for permitting their self-deception when they take our words in a sense that we do not mean."

"Truth requires not only that we should say nothing that we know to be false, but also that we should weigh our statements and not make rash and unconsidered assertions. There are some people whose talk runs babbling along like a stream in a fresh, and with as little meaning. A man with a love for truth will be more sparing of his words, and will weigh them before giving them currency."

"A good intention certainly cannot make a bad action good. It is not lawful to tell a lie even to save another's

life, according to the teaching of Innocent III. Evil must not be done that good may come of it. This is the teaching of Holy Scripture and of the Catholic Church, nor have Jesuits any other doctrine different from that of the Church. Father Dasbach promised to give any one two thousand florins who would prove in open court that the Jesuits had ever taught that the end justifies the means. Count Paul von Hoensbroech undertook to do so, but he failed in his suit when it was tried at Cologne, in the spring of 1905." *

The result of study of this sort in recent years has corrected many errors, which I have taught as well as held; has banished prejudices; and has for the first time given me some conception of the place which should be given Moral Theology in training of the clergy. I know that the Jesuits were not responsible for the formal teaching and defense of the principle "the end justifies the means," a "maxim," according to Bishop Creighton, "emphatically condemned by all religious bodies, and frequently acted on by all alike." That some Jesuits seem to have acted on it in past centuries seems to be established by good evidence. If so, it merely signifies that, like all other organizations, the Order has had some black chapters in its history. To admit this is not to whitewash Jesuits by a species of blackmail, but to face difficult facts. The principle that a good end justifies the use of necessary means is one on which we all at times feel constrained to act; for example, in sanctioning a just war. There would be general consent that war is an evil; and yet most feel it the indispensable means for securing of certain ends.

* Slater: *Manual of Moral Theology,* Vol. I, pp. 469, 49.

We are always in difficulty when we have to face it; yet to adopt it seems often a plain duty. Of flagrant misdeeds committed under claim of its sanction, more must be attributed to the influence of Luther than to that of Loyola. Insistence on "justification by faith only" was used as cover for indifference to all "works of the law," issuing in most shameless immorality. The Jesuits were never responsible for anything quite like the excesses of the Anabaptists in Münster. In this regard it is hard to see who would be especially justified in throwing stones. Anglicans should be cautious. There is a confusing collection of "probable opinions" in their Articles and Prayer Books, and an irresistible incentive to mental reservations in the attempt to reconcile Episcopacy with Royal Supremacy, and "Protestant Episcopal" with "Holy Catholic." *Crede experto.*

Study of books of casuistry has not only disabused me of errors concerning the influence of the Society of Jesus, but has also forced attention to one aspect of the Church's life which has caused searchings of conscience as well as revisions of judgment. Jesuit ethics which once acted with repellent force have proven magnetic. The reading of books of Moral Theology gives a sense of the moral majesty of the Catholic Church, of its practical insight into all sorts of individual needs, of the glory and strength of discipline, of the failure to measure up to the highest standards of morality and sanctity in those religious systems which have neglected or abandoned it. The system of discipline developed as a means of training souls through the Sacrament of

Penance is the approximate embodiment of Divine justice and mercy. The development of the science of conduct shows increasing apprehension of the moral content of revealed truth, and increasing skill in its application. Outside the Catholic Church there is no parallel. Within it alone does the Forgiveness of Sins have full and definite meaning, as they can best appreciate who have striven to recover Penance as an indispensable means of salvation, acting apart from the will and mind of the authority recognized by them. And all who relate the spirit of discipline to the beauty of holiness cannot fail to recognize that the genius of Loyola and of Loyalty are akin.

A similar deep impression was made by examination of Jesuit treatment of social, political, and economic ethics. Ever since in Oxford days I became interested in the Christian Social Union, and regarded with admiration the efforts to apply Christian principles to social problems made by such leaders as Bishop Westcott, Bishop Gore, and Canon Scott Holland, I had, without special knowledge or special share in such work, been sympathetically interested in all Church work along lines of Social Service. Any one who knows what has been done in the Church of England and in the American Episcopal Church can bear witness to the zeal and energy of many workers and to success along various lines. Yet he will be bound to admit that much of the work is crude, and more of it at random. All recognize Social Service as a duty, and wish to do something; but most cannot tell just what. Committees and commissions find some difficulty in making convention re-

ports that will really seem to indicate progress: there is much need for patience in tolerating the prominence of a few, who talk rather than work, care much for fads and more for self-advertisement. On the whole, the work is that of well-intentioned amateurs.

Catholic work along these lines seems to introduce one to a different atmosphere of very definite work under direction of experts and professionals. There seems to be superiority in two ways: first, in clearer grasp of the Christian principle and unswerving adherence to the Christian viewpoint, in which they would have no advantage over the chief Anglican leaders in these matters, though much over the rank and file; and second, in their full and sympathetic apprehension of the social and industrial life which they seek to affect. Their thought and activity is that of masters of their subject, if mastery may be affirmed of a subject in regard to which so many judgments must be tentative. Yet it is clear that Catholics are qualified to lead in the work of social reform; and among the most prominent of their chiefs are Jesuits.* In comparing notes with others who have similar interests and more knowledge, I have found corroboration of this impression. I quote by permission from a letter received from Professor Henry Jones Ford of Princeton University:

* Any who wish to make a beginning of investigation into this aspect of Catholic activities, may usefully read such books as: Plater: *The Priest and Social Action;* Day: *Catholic Democracy, Individualism and Socialism;* Cathrein-Gettelmann: *Socialism;* Slater: Paper on *Modern Sociology* in *Questions of Moral Theology.*

"As a student of political science, I have had from time to time occasion to examine the works the Jesuits are publishing in regard to the political and social problems of the times. I have always been impressed by their high quality. They are remarkable for firmness in grasp of subject, knowledge of details, accuracy of statement, precision in use of terms, calmness in discussion, and candor in argument. I venture to say that no one can examine the treatises that are being produced by the Jesuit Fathers, John A. Stratton, Joseph Keating, and Charles Plater in England, Ernest R. Hull in India, and Joseph Husslein in this country, without being forced to recognize their great power and copious information. In the voluminous literature produced by the Socialist movement, the most judicial and comprehensive treatise is that of Victor Cathrein, S.J., of Valkenberg, Holland. It has been translated into every European language and has run through numerous editions in Germany, where it has had a deep effect on public opinion. Several editions have appeared in the United States, and everywhere the work has established itself as a standard authority on the history, characteristics and aims of Socialism." *

Every investigation of recent efforts to apply Christianity to the social and industrial problems of the day

* Professor Ford also comments: "One of the surprises that have come to me as a Catholic is the greater sense of intellectual freedom. The Church is so big, so strong, so sure of itself, that it can allow ample room for the play of individuality."

There must always be a calmness and sense of freedom where there is a background of confidence, *Securus judicat orbis terrarum;* something that cannot come from even the most complacent private judgment, *Securus judico, orbus terrorum.*

must result in deeper appreciation of Leo XIII's great Encyclical *Rerum novarum*. This is the constitution and charter of all genuinely Christian Social Service, and is classic in its statement of necessary points of departure and of inevitable conclusions. It is being used as basis for the most promising activities. From such knowledge as I have been able to obtain, I feel very strongly that the Roman Catholic Church—quite apart from any question of its claim of ecclesiastical supremacy—is the greatest force in the nation to maintain authority against anarchy; the sanctity of marriage against enemies of the home; justice and order in industrial relations against the disorders due to class prejudice and inordinate greed. Its effectiveness as a bulwark of order and true freedom in this age of unrest and uncertainty is in no small degree due to the alertness and adaptability of the great Order of the sons of St. Ignatius; and in my own case, it is perhaps an example of coming to "adore what one has burned," that in Jesuit Ethics, as known at first-hand rather than by hearsay, I have recognized one of the chief forces for good in Roman Catholicism.

CHAPTER XIV

CONVERSION

The vanishing of illusions and removal of prejudices is not conversion. Many of the changes of opinion which I have recorded not only came about while I had no intention of giving up my post in the Episcopal Church, but were quite consistent with holding it. My opinions in regard to Roman Catholicism passed through four stages: it is not so bad after all; it is really quite good; it is the best thing I know; it is the Church. Only when the last was reached was there genuine conversion. None of the others, not even the third, compelled change of allegiance. It is quite conceivable that any non-Catholic might hold them, and even take up cudgels in behalf of Roman Catholicism, as an interested outsider intent on fair play. But at the last stage one's duty is obvious. If the Roman Communion is to be identified with the Catholic Church, one who believes in the Catholic Church must seek admission with no regard to terms. To believe in the Church is to trust it to know what is right. Unconditional surrender alone is possible. My attitude for a long time was that of an approving critic: I knew that, if conversion came, it must become that of a penitent sinner.

The change came eventually with recognition of the principle of primacy as integral and essential to the

Church, that is, of the papal claim. I have not yet acted on the conviction for three reasons. At the time it came, I was still Bishop of Delaware. I wished to make a formal statement of reasons. I have wished to test the conviction by a little waiting. I have had no doubt as to the outcome. For some time it has seemed to me that the only possible alternatives are Roman Catholicism or Agnosticism. To my surprise I have been feeling the force of agnostic arguments. Never for a moment have I believed it possible that I should end in Agnosticism; but I have been seeing plainly the plausibility of much that can be said in its behalf. Divided Christendom repels and paralyzes. So I have wished to wait a little, on my own account, as well as, for various reasons, on account of others. The conviction has become stronger and clearer day by day. All sorts of things, before confused, have dropped into obviously right places. There has come a new semblance of order in the world as one looks out upon it. The efforts of private judgment to appraise, understand, and pronounce upon everything have come to seem ridiculous. Many old opinions appear useless and foolish, though often having new value as gaining a place in relation to things as a whole. So far as I am personally concerned, the only feeling is one of content. I have not been seeking personal happiness, or peace, or usefulness. I have wished to be identified with the Catholic Church to which my life has been pledged. In having found what I believe to be the true Ark of Salvation, every personal wish is satisfied by reception into it. Presumably my active life ends; but that makes no dif-

ference. It is certainly a great relief to exchange the task of trying to reform the Church—the necessary effort for all who hold my former point of view—for the simpler one of letting the Church try to reform me! That seems a more reasonable way to view things.

One satisfaction in making this decision, if that word can be applied to recognition of an obvious duty and necessity, is that it is the choice of the leaden casket. "Who chooseth me, must give and hazard all he hath." There can be no other condition for gaining anything really worth while. "What many men desire" and "As much as he deserves" obviously correspond to inferior motives and inferior attainments. In Delaware I had what many men desire and much more than I deserved. To begin with, it was so identified with all I was bound to value most highly, that from every point of view I could give and hazard everything for what it stood for. It was impossible to wish for anything else. But with a changed point of view, so that *for me* it no longer stood for the things of supreme value, I could not keep it. That would have been an injury to all concerned. What now possesses chief value for me is elsewhere. The Kingdom of Heaven is "treasure hid in a field" and a "pearl of great price." Possession, not cost, is the thing to consider. And this even when part of the price must be paid by other people. The end can only bring good and happiness to all concerned. The only thing worth while is doing duty as we see it; the only things worth having are those for which we most care. I for one have had things I set great store by; and I have them now.

Newman once said: "Rome did not make us Catholics: Oxford made us Catholics." I should venture to put myself in this category, if I did not feel it necessary to look behind Oxford to St. Paul's School. St. Paul's School made me a Catholic, in giving rudiments of belief, and in stimulating religious instincts, which, if they were allowed to live and grow, could only be satisfied with what was believed to be the Catholic Church. The St. Paul's teaching only pointed directly to the life in the Episcopal Church, of which it gave an attractive example: but it seems to me now to have been pointing through that toward something else. I cannot set up to be a good specimen of what St. Paul's ought to produce; yet it would seem to me that the course my experience has made necessary, is, for me at least, the only way of living up to my St. Paul's birthright.

So far am I from repudiating the religious experiences which I have shared in the past, that it is enthusiastic veneration for them, and belief in their reality, that impels toward what I believe guarantees them. Grace may be given without being guaranteed. I have a sort of "receptionist theory" of Orders and Sacraments, in view of anomalous conditions in the Christian world. The Church, as Divinely-appointed means of salvation, alone guarantees gifts of Divine grace. Yet there are so many who, from no fault of their own, do not, and cannot, know where and what the Church is. In perfectly good faith they come before God, believing themselves to be in His Church, and wishing to receive all that through the Church He gives. Belief in Divine love and mercy compels us to assume that God will not

fail them. "Him that cometh to Me, I will in no wise cast out." "According to thy faith, be it unto thee." Our Lord certainly gives full measure of His grace to all who can receive it; and, no matter what the defects of ecclesiastical systems, He will not fail to respond to perfectly good faith.

This is not a notion I have recently taken up in order to escape personal difficulties. Believing in Episcopacy as Divine-ordered, I used to think of the Church as existing in its three branches, which held to the Historic Episcopate. Through the Church so conceived, I believed that there was normal ministration of grace. Yet I did not think that this was never given through non-episcopal religious bodies. For example, in the case of my own Presbyterian and Congregationalist connections. In the ecclesiastical systems with which they were identified I did not believe; yet when they presented themselves humbly before God wishing His grace, I never doubted that they received all that was possible, and, in many ways, what is normally given through the Church. With a changed conception of what constitutes the Catholic Priesthood and Episcopate, I am only now applying to myself the sort of principle which before I wished to apply to the cases of my great-grandparents. I have no doubt as to the reality of what I myself have received and done, when acting in good faith in the Episcopal Church, not because I still believe in the regularity and validity of its ecclesiastical system; but because I am confident Our Lord never fails those who trust Him. *Sacramentis Deus non obligatur, sed nos.*

Yet neither in the past, nor in the present, has this belief in "uncovenanted mercies" seemed any reason for indifference as to the nature of the Church, or for assuming that because people were good, there was no need of trying to make them better. It is all-important to be within the One Church, in which alone is fulness of faith, normally evoking and using fulness of grace. "Receptionist theories" of Sacraments are among those permitted to Anglicans. I avail myself of ancient privilege in a last exercise of private judgment before its voluntary abdication.

Old St. Paul's boys will have recognized in the title of my book the opening words of the School Ode,

Salve Mater, almior
Alma luce auroræ,
Cordi nostro carior
Creturo fulgore.

Socii, nunc libera
Voce laus tollatur.
Factis et ad æthera
*Volet alma Mater.**

They will now see why I have used it. It is because the fundamental reason of my seeking admission into the Roman Catholic Church is the wish to be loyal to what as a boy I learned at St. Paul's. In my case, it is only thus that there can be

Pietas per omnia
In fidelitate.

* Sung to the tune of *Maryland, My Maryland.*

It has been the simple lessons learned at St. Paul's that made me first love the innermost life of the Episcopal Church, and now has made me feel that in the Roman Catholic Church is more to love still, full instead of partial realization, substance in place of shadow.

It is this that has helped through special difficulties in the way of believing. In St. Paul's I was taught to believe in the Incarnation, with consequent love and veneration for Our Lord's Mother and His Saints, although I was long and slow in applying the lesson. Hence it has been easy to see how one may, and must, say:

Salve Mater misericordiæ,
Mater Dei, et Mater veniæ,
Mater spei, et Mater gratiæ,
Mater plena sanctæ lætitiæ, O Maria.

It is this which has led to fuller realization of what is meant by

Salve Mater Ecclesia
Domus fidelium,
Lassi refugium,
Mortui anastasia.

It was in the Cathedral in Philadelphia in 1916 that I first had a vivid sense of the Church as a great Mother, very wistful and very tender. It seemed to explain something I read not long after in Newman's *Loss and Gain.*

"He felt himself possessed, he knew not how, by a high super-human power, which seemed able to push through

mountains, and to walk on the sea. With winter all around him, he felt within like the spring-tide, when all is new and bright. He perceived that he had found, what indeed he had never sought, because he had never known what it was, but what he had ever wanted—a soul sympathetic with his own. Was this, he asked himself, the communion of Saints? . . . 'O Mighty Mother!' burst from his lips; he quickened his pace almost to a trot, scaling the steep ascents and diving into the hollows. 'O Mighty Mother!' he still said, half unconsciously; 'O mighty Mother! I come, O mighty Mother! I come; but I am far from home. Spare me a little; I come with what speed I may, but I am slow of foot, and not as others, O mighty Mother!'"

Hugh Benson enlarges on the same idea.

"To the world she is a Queen, rigid, arrogant, and imperious, robed in stiff gold and jewels, looking superbly out upon crime and revolt; but to her own children she is Mother even more than Queen. She fingers the hurts of her tiniest sons, listens to their infinitesimal sorrows, teaches them patiently their lessons, desires passionately that they should grow up as princes should. And, supremely above all, she knows how to speak to them of their Father and Lord, how to interpret His will to them, how to tell them the story of His exploits; she breathes into them something of her own love and reverence; she encourages them to be open and unafraid with both her and Him; she takes them apart by a secret way to introduce them to His presence."

"I do not suppose that there is any Catholic alive who would dare to say that he has no difficulties even now; but 'ten thousand difficulties do not make one doubt.' There remain always the old eternal problems of sin and free will; but to one who has once looked into the eyes of this great

Mother, these problems are as nothing. She knows, if we do not; she knows, even if she does not say that she knows; for within her somewhere, far down in her great heart, there lies hid the very wisdom of God Himself." *

But how relate consciousness of the great Mother, late recognized, to recollection of the one, believed to be Mother, by whom one was reared and cared for? It is the same Mother all the time, only for a while wearing a disguise. It is not repudiation of the Mother to prefer her with the disguise left off.

It is what I was early taught, and have always believed, about the Church and her chief characteristics and functions, that has impelled the giving of allegiance where these are most apparent. Reverence for the Scriptures, which our Puritan forefathers had; unswerving loyalty to the ancient Creeds; fullest realization of the Divine Sacraments; fullest utilization of the Historic Priesthood: all these things are what we have always been taught to care for. For their sakes must we seek the Church in which they, and many things beside, alone have rightful place. This is the true home of all Our Lord's loyal servants; yet, if they be separated in the dimness of earth's tangles, we know that they will ultimately be brought together in His Presence and His perfect service.

For the first time I seem to be discovering the meaning of things I have long thought and talked about. Words which meant much in times past have come to mean more in the present than it was possible to con-

* Benson: *Confessions of a Convert,* pp. 159, 110.

ceive when they were first used. For the first time I seem to attach definite meaning to what I said in a lecture delivered over six years ago.

"American life, national and religious, must show social coherence and subordination as a means of unification. . . . More and more we need the safeguard of the corporate principle in life to correct one-sided tendencies; more and more we need the philosophy of society and the gospel of the Church for the security of highest individual development. . . . In national problems we need greater comprehensiveness of view with subordination of detail, the sort of thing which, in the religious sphere, is given by conception of the Catholic Church. We need the sense of the Kingdom of God for the preservation of the Republic. All that America stands for can only be guaranteed by that corporate sense which thinks of the nation as a whole, and rises from consciousness of the nation to consciousness of the brotherhood of the race; and this conception comes to us chiefly from the Church of Christ. The central thought of the Church's faith is that of the presence and spiritual activity of Our Lord, Who is not a mere figure, dear but dim, in ancient history, but the one great present Reality. If we wish to be abreast of the times, we shall be filled with this faith and hope. The cry of the hour, as of the ages, is for fuller realization of the Living Christ, fuller appreciation of the life of the Living Church. This thought of eternal life, of present vigor and action, makes an especial appeal to the American zest for realizing present opportunities. This is the very heart of the Catholic Faith, which combines permanent and variable, oldest truth with newest needs.

"There are three watchwords to which every American heart responds, Freedom, Sympathy, Variety. These things

we seek in our social and national life; these things we wish in the Church. We also speak much of Unity; but perhaps we fail often to think long enough, and feel deeply enough, to know what Unity means. We ought also to take account of the significance of the New Testament word Fulness. . . . Puzzling perhaps, but serving to express the idea of a comprehensive faith for a composite people. This is precisely what is meant by the Catholic Faith of the Catholic Church, the faith in all the harmony of its completeness for all the nations of the world." *

BIRCHMERE, November 14, 1919.

* *Catholic and Protestant,* pp. 89 ff.